BIBLIOTHECA
FF. PRÆDICATORUM
CONVENTUS
CIVIT. BENITIÆ
Lit.
Pl.

LECTURES

ON

CHRISTIAN UNITY,

DELIVERED IN

S. ANN'S CHURCH, EIGHTH-STREET, DURING THE SEASON OF ADVENT, 1866.

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

ON THE CONDITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, AND OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

BY

THE REV. THOMAS S. PRESTON,

PASTOR OF S. ANN'S CHURCH, AND CHANCELLOR OF THE DIOCESE.

"Whosoever recedeth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God."—II. S. JOHN, 9.

NEW YORK:

D. & J. SADLIER & CO., 31 BARCLAY ST.

MONTREAL:

CORNER NOTRE-DAME AND ST. FRANCIS XAVIER STREETS.

MRS. HICKEY, 128 FEDERAL STREET, BOSTON.

1867.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven,

By D. & J. SADLIER & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

JOHN G. SHEA, Stereotyper,
80 Centre Street

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

INTRODUCTION.

THE following lectures were delivered in S. Ann's Church, during the season of Advent, 1866. Many who heard them, and many more who were unable to hear them, expressed the desire to see them in print. They are, therefore, published with the earnest hope that they may reach some minds who are seeking the truth, and lead them to the haven of rest. The argument of the lectures is very simple. The demonstration of the necessity of unity is drawn from reason, Holy Scripture, and history. Protestantism is then examined in the abstract and in the concrete, and found not only incon-

Rec: 1075

sistent with unity but totally destructive of it. The claims of the Catholic Church are finally stated and proved by arguments drawn from reason alone. To make the work more complete an appendix is added, in which the position of the Church of England and of the Eastern Churches is examined more at length. In regard to the former body, there is some pretension of ecclesiastical authority, calculated, at times, to deceive, while very few know much of the real condition of the latter communion. The author has not aimed to exhaust the subject, but only to place in a clear and popular form the arguments in favor of the Catholic Church from the point of Christian unity. He has answered objections which have often been brought before him in the course of his ministry, and which have been obstacles in the way of some, if not many, converts. In the examination of Protes-

tant systems the fairest view has been taken, and nearly all the facts adduced have been drawn from Protestant sources. No unkind word has been spoken, and no advantage taken of any adversary. If, in the discussion of any points, the author has displayed undue warmth, the reader is asked to charge it rather to zeal for truth, than to any want of charity towards those in error. As it regards the Episcopal Church, so well known in former days, it has been necessary to speak plainly of her orders, and of the inconsistency of some of her members, who desire to be Catholics and Protestants at the same time. If any are satisfied with dreams of the past, or with pretensions which have no foundation in the reality, the world at large is not so easily contented. Say what we will of the evils of our day, it is certainly a practical age in which we live, and men are

disposed to push all principles to their logical conclusions. We grant to every man his right to judge for himself in matters of pure reason, and even urge upon his notice the weighty responsibility which devolves upon him of examining well the credentials of God's revelation. The question which each one must settle is one of fact. Has God made a revelation, and if so, how has He made it? Is Jesus Christ a divine teacher, and has He established a Church as the instrumentality by which He teaches mankind? There is no middle ground to be taken. Either there is one Church, with divine authority, or there is none at all. Human organizations, for religious or benevolent purposes, are not properly Churches. If there be no such Church, then we are forced to relinquish all semblance of ecclesiastical pretension, all manner of dogmatism, and rationalism must run its course.

Those who shrink from the effect must remove the cause. Those who would uphold Christianity must do so on sound and logical principles, or they bring to confusion the religion they profess.

The author has had experience of the systems of Protestantism and Catholicity. He was once a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and for three years one of her ministers. Seventeen years have now passed away since the happy day of his conversion to the one true faith. Not one moment of those years has failed to increase his gratitude to God for the unspeakable mercy by which he was brought to the peace and light of the Catholic religion. He has found all that he sought for, and more than his most sanguine hopes foretold. He has found freedom in his soul, illumination in his intellect, and joy in his heart. Every

day has developed more and more of the treasures of grace contained in the home of truth and love, where the God-Man dwelleth and dispenses his favors. He yearns to bring others to the same blessedness, and prays the Good Lord to make him an humble instrument in guiding the wandering feet into the ways of peace. With such motives for the publication of his lectures, he lays his offering at the feet of the great apostle, who, leaning on the breast of his Lord, learned how to love God, and man in God, and how to value the truth for which his divine Master became incarnate.

T. S. P.

NEW YORK, *Feast of S. John the Evangelist*, 1866.

INDEX.

LECTURE FIRST. PAGE

The Necessity of Christian Unity 11

LECTURE SECOND.

The Impossibility of Unity under the Protestant Theory 57

LECTURE THIRD.

The Claims of Protestantism 84

LECTURE FOURTH.

The Claims of the Catholic Church 128

APPENDIX.

PART FIRST.

The Position of the English Church 165

PART SECOND.

The Position of the Eastern Churches 211

NOTE A.

Testimonies from the Christian Fathers in favor of Transubstantion, the Invocation of Saints, and Purgatory 239

NOTE B.

Numerical Condition of Sects professing Christianity .. 261

A PRAYER FOR ALL WANDERERS FROM THE FAITH.

(By His Eminence, Cardinal Wiseman.)

O God, who hast given Thy only-begotten Son as a sacrifice of propitiation for the salvation of the world, that being exalted above the earth, He might draw to Himself the hearts of all men; and who dost not wish that any should perish, but dost earnestly desire that all should be saved; we humbly beseech Thee that, by the wounds and most precious blood of that beloved Son, Thou wouldst graciously look upon all men in all parts of the world, whom the subtilty of error has deceived, or the darkness of ignorance has blinded, and lead them back into the way of truth and salvation. Remember, O Lord, that they are Thy creatures: despise not therefore the work of Thy hands. Regard the tears of Thy Church, the spouse of Thy Son; hear the groans of Thy servants; and grant that all heresies and schisms being done away, we may enjoy perpetual peace and concord. Grant that all nations, joined in unity of faith, and perfect charity, under the government of Peter, may be brought to the pastures of eternal life; and let there be through the whole world, one fold and one shepherd. So be it, so be it. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

LECTURES ON UNITY.

LECTURE FIRST.

THE NECESSITY OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.

"One body, and one spirit: as you are called in one hope of your vocation. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."—EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS, iv. 4–6.

No reflecting mind will deny that the question we are about to discuss is a most important one, and, moreover, that it is the great question of the day. If Christianity be identified with the profession of certain doctrines, as the world has always supposed, unity among those who defend those doctrines is vital to its existence. The fall of faith and the open avowal of infidelity are the consequences of discord and disunion. Before that religious movement which has been commonly called the Reformation the necessity of unity was recognized among all who called themselves followers of

Christ. And now that that movement has spent its force, and shows its results everywhere in the constant multiplication of divisions, earnest and thoughtful men are looking well to the old foundations, and anxiously inquiring if some way cannot be found to bring together the true in heart, and to make them brethren once more. Every year, meetings of sincere Protestants are held to accomplish this end, and though no very favorable results appear, still they are not discouraged. Unbelief is becoming so prevalent on all sides that it seems necessary to make common cause against a common adversary, or to confess the defeat of Christianity. Catholics are not uninterested in these movements; for, although these assemblies for promoting unity are hostile to them, and attended often by violent attacks upon the Church, yet much of this hostility is the fruit of ignorance and misunderstanding. Very many, if they were better informed, would cease all their bitter opposition against us. For our own part, we can never have any bitterness nor partisanship. Different factions of Protestantism may contend against each other with no unsparing language, and all may unite in our condemna-

tion; but no true Catholic can be intemperate in speech, much less in heart. There is a plain reason for this in the fact that the Church is a divine organization sustained by an almighty power. At least such is the firm conviction which holds us together, gives us courage, and keeps us from being personally sensitive when our religion is assailed. No human pride is touched when men speak against our faith, for we had nothing to do with the making of that faith, and we know that its consistency does not depend upon us. And when we speak of the claims of our religion, or announce our doctrines and urge them upon men, it is not to advance our own opinions so much as to benefit mankind, and promote their best happiness, temporal and spiritual. We feel that the Church answers the very questions which are agitating their souls; that it responds to the wants of their spiritual being now unsatisfied; that it is the only and the divine barrier to infidelity so fast increasing among us. We feel that earnest men may seek in vain for unity among elements discordant by nature; that they must come for very safety to the Old Church established by God, which is of necessity one;

which has stood the shock of many centuries, and which will stand till the great Founder of Christianity shall come again. It is in this spirit that these lectures are begun; with the earnest desire for truth, and a comprehensive charity for all who differ from us. We desire to lay down the principles which may by God's blessing guide the inquirer to the haven of peace, and solve the important religious difficulties of the day. We desire only to say that which is true without the slightest exaggeration, and to avoid the least word which may unnecessarily offend. It is the interest of no man to conceal the truth from himself. By so doing he only does himself the greatest possible injury. Two contradictory opinions cannot both be right; one is true, and the other must be false. Reason must be consistent with herself, and no one can really embrace two doctrines which mutually destroy each other.

Our present aim is to consider the whole subject of Christian unity—seen not so much from the side of the Catholic Church as from reason; to advance no arguments which are not legitimate, and to state nothing as fact which is not generally admitted. The object of this lecture

is to establish the necessity of Christian unity, and the points advanced to-night are fundamental. They are as the foundation of the whole edifice we propose to build.

I.

Let us begin by a definition of terms, that there may be no misunderstanding of our meaning. By Christianity we intend to signify the complex of those doctrines delivered to man by our Lord Jesus Christ. We do not now go into the explanation of what those doctrines are. The truths which He taught, taken together in their necessarily harmonious whole, form the system which we name after Him—Christianity.

By Christian unity we mean unity among those who profess Christianity. There is one kind of unity in the confession of the same doctrines; but this is not enough. We comprehend more than this; we mean a visible external unity. As all Christians must hold the same essential truths, they must also visibly confess them; and no way of doing so seems possible except by the unity of a visible body. All who

call themselves Christians seem to think some kind of external organization necessary. We believe that the very existence of Christianity depends upon the unity of one visibly teaching or confessing body. As the complex of truths taught by our Lord is called, in the abstract, Christianity, so the visible body of those who profess and defend those truths may bear the same name in the concrete.

II.

Our argument then stands thus.

Christianity consists in the practical belief of certain fixed doctrines revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ; but these doctrines cannot be maintained without unity among those who profess them; therefore unity is necessary to Christianity.

1. If Christianity does not consist of certain fixed doctrines, it will be difficult to define it at all. It is a nonentity. Christ was a teacher, and confessedly preached through Galilee and Jerusalem His system of religion. Christianity is that system, and embraces therefore all the doctrines He taught. Those who follow Him

must receive all His teachings, and in the way He delivered them. No one can draw any distinction between these doctrines, and call some essential and others non-essential without His authority. To do so is really to reject a portion of the truths delivered. We assume here that He was a divine teacher, because we are arguing only with those who call themselves Christians. Whatever, then, has been revealed through Him is part of the system of divine truth communicated to mankind. No reason could have by itself discovered this truth, and therefore the whole fabric rests on His authority. We receive it because He was God, incapable of deceiving or being deceived, and perfectly able in His own way to make known what He wished man to have the knowledge of. We can then only receive or reject His revelation. We must take it entire, or we do not take it as revelation at all, for the motive which induces us to receive a part, will, in like manner, induce us to receive the whole. We cannot be inconsistent with our own reason. If any one accepts a part of the teachings of Christ, because he likes them, and rejects a part because he does not like them, he is not a Christian in the strict sense of the term.

And the ground on which he accepts or rejects certain doctrines is his own judgment. By this exercise of judgment, he refuses to believe that which he dislikes, and by the same judgment he also is willing to receive what agrees with his own opinions. He is therefore his own teacher, and cannot call Christ his master. We think, then, that there is hardly any one who can deny that Christianity embraces all the truths taught by our Lord Jesus Christ, and embodied in that revelation which He made.

But we have said that a *practical* belief is necessary, because the doctrines of Christ are eminently intended to influence the whole life of man. They cannot be believed without being acted upon, since they so nearly concern all our relations with God and our fellow-creatures. They are not as the abstract truths of the sciences, which one may accept or reject without any moral change. They concern that gracious interposition which divine mercy has been pleased to make for the salvation of our race, fallen in sin. They enlighten us as to our condition in this life, our hopes in the future life, and the means of acquiring that beatitude which all naturally seek after. No one can re-

ceive them without being practically influenced by them, and they directly tend to the reformation and guidance of our lives in the acquisition of all those virtues which adorn society, or make up the happiness of mankind.

2. The doctrines of Christ cannot be maintained without unity among those who profess them. This can be readily seen; first, from the nature of the doctrines themselves; secondly, from the necessity of a human instrumentality to defend and propagate them; and thirdly, from the facts of history showing the lamentable evils of division.

Without entering into any discussion of the truths taught by our Lord, it will be, perhaps, allowed us to say, that the direct effect of these truths, and one of their principal aims, is to produce union among believers. The knowledge of God in the natural order tends to produce charity, but the revelation of Jesus Christ ascends higher, and places man's brotherhood upon a loftier basis. It makes us not only children of one common Father, but brethren redeemed by the death of one common Saviour. It brings together high and low, rich and poor, as the recipients of one common bounty, teaches

us our need of divine mercy, and shows to all one way of salvation. We are to be saved by faith in the same truths, all of which are proposed to us on the authority of Christ, by obedience to the same precepts from which no one can be exempt, and by the good use of the same graces which all need.

The perfect unity of doctrine prevents disputes arising from the differences of intellect; the harmony of one moral code removes all questions as to the conduct of man, while the constant participation of the same grace preserves humility and augments charity. A more admirable scheme could not be devised for the elevation of our race.

Where, then, shall there be the opening for discord, or how shall disunion find its way among the believers of these doctrines of Christ? As all the truths of the harmonious whole tend to unite men by the strongest bonds, there can be no discord, unless it be by disobedience to the revelation confessedly received, or a disposition to reject all or any portion of it. Yet, by the plain statement of our arguments, those who disobey the Founder of our religion are not truly His followers, and those who reject any portion

of His teachings are not really Christians. Let us add, also, that if the Scriptures or history are to be taken in evidence, unity is one of the very doctrines on which so much stress is laid by our Lord and His disciples, and the rejection of this doctrine alone would be sufficient to cut us off from the heritage of His obedient followers.

But, secondly, the doctrines proposed to our belief are proposed to men as such, and are kept alive in the world through human instrumentality. Christ has left us this duty, and, in our several stations, we have to teach others, to guard and defend the precious trust He has committed to our care. He will not send angels to teach us, neither will He by miracle guard against the evil effects of our bad example. By what greater or more powerful instrumentality can Christianity be maintained than by the unity of all its adherents? Such is the argument of our Lord Himself in His sacrificial prayer: "And for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth. And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me. That they all may be *one*, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in

us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."* The world will not give credence to a divided or discordant body. When men ask for the truths of Christ, they need a quick and positive answer. They must know where to look for light, and must not doubt as to the oracle of truth, nor as to the replies it will give. If some say one thing and others another, they will sooner or later give up all in weariness or disgust. They will say, with very good reason, "If Christians themselves cannot agree, how shall they teach us? if their faith cannot unite its own professors, how shall it have any claims upon us?" And, in rigid truth, what power to control mankind can that system have which cannot bind together its own adherents? These are arguments to which there is no answer. Here are certain truths of the highest importance, necessary to the salvation of all men, and those who pretend to defend them and to make them known to others, cannot agree either as to the truths or the best mode of leading others to believe them. Surely there is no possibility of finding any instrumentality to defend

* S. John, xvii. 19–21.

or propagate Christianity. If it has no resources within itself, it cannot continue to live, much less to claim the obedience of all nations. It cannot seek out of itself for a principle of life. It is not even as good as the human systems which, binding their members together by certain philosophical truths, have at least been able to live for a season. The experience of every-day life confirms all our reasoning. What do men do who form an organization for any scientific or philanthropic purpose? Do they not at first take care for the perfection of their own organization, and the unity of their members? Do they not realize that this is the first necessity of their existence, and that discord will soon put an end to the best planned or most nobly conceived purposes? Surely Almighty God is as wise as His own creatures, and the system devised by Him as perfect as those of men. His only Son would not become man and submit to the ignominy of the cross for an end of a day, or a provision which was not vital to the whole human race. We may then speculate as we please; we have to take men as they are, and Christianity will never be maintained and extended except by the unity of its adherents.

Lastly, history is a teacher whose voice no sane man can refuse to hear, and against facts there can be no arguments. The Catholic Church has ever held unity as one of her essential doctrines. "I believe in *one* holy, catholic, and apostolic Church" is a part of her unchanging creed. She regards this as one of the verities of Christianity, and teaches that the rejection of it is fatal to religion. One body of all who profess the one faith, Catholic, because for all the world and in all the world; and apostolic, because founded by the labors of apostles, and the inheritor of their doctrines. This is her preaching to the world, which for eighteen centuries has never varied. The evils flowing from division cannot, then, be laid to her charge, and for the sad consequences of separation from her fold she is not responsible. Up to the time of the movement generally termed the Reformation, those who were called Christians presented a united front against infidelity. From that time the principle was adopted by very many that unity was not necessary, and that it was left to the individual acting honestly to choose for himself either to remain in the old Church or to leave it; either to accept all the commonly received doctrines, or

only some of them. The first and natural consequence of this principle was not only the separation of many from the Catholic Church, but the division of those who did separate. Under the general name of Protestantism were included all who made objection to the ancient faith, and they soon began to divide and subdivide, until they appeared to be as much opposed to each other as to the Church they had left. Among such discordant elements unity was impossible, and in the progress of time we have seen constant and increasing divisions, to which, in the natural course of things, there can be no end. Let us survey the field, and ask any candid mind if Christianity has not lost by this disunion. Has not infidelity assumed a bold face, and is it not rampant to a degree that may well alarm the sincere believer? We can well estimate, even within our own recollection, the change that has come over society. Protestantism has not been able to hold its own. Its children have forsaken the footprints of their fathers, and creeds have become obsolete in the course of one century. First one heard the denial of the divinity of the Founder of our religion by those who still called themselves Christians; then

little by little all mysteries were swept away, as if the relations between the Infinite and the finite in nature or grace could ever be perfectly comprehended. There is no power of cohesion to hold together those who profess to believe the same truths, and no authority to determine how far one may go and still remain within the pale of nominal Christianity. The result is, that every stigma is removed in our society from the boldest infidelity. The great truths of heaven and hell are openly questioned; even the responsibility of human actions is denied, and God's providence in our affairs altogether ignored. We have come back to a state not much better than that of paganism, with the one exception that the traditions of the Catholic religion which formed society, still exert their influence.

We cannot wonder that an eminent Protestant divine, in view of all these facts, has said that Christianity has proved a failure, and that the world stands in need of another interposition of God, like the coming of another Messiah. The general conviction among sincere Protestants, that every thing should now be sacrificed for union, is an unanswerable argument for its ne-

cessity, and a confession that they cannot stand against the tide of liberalism and impiety which threaten to sweep away every vestige of dogmatism, and to leave their children without a creed.

III.

We proceed now to demonstrate that the Holy Scriptures are in accordance with human reason, and teach the necessity of Christian unity.

It is not necessary at this moment to establish the authenticity or inspiration of the Scriptures. We freely admit, as we shall afterwards show, that on the theory of Protestantism they cannot be proved to be the word of God. Nevertheless, the majority of Protestants receive them as such, and on their concession we are allowed to argue from them. We accept them on the authority of the Church which we believe to be divine, and they receive them because they choose to do so on evidence which seems satisfactory to themselves. So far, then, we can meet on common ground. Our argument will necessarily be brief, and will consist, first, of facts

established by the Scriptures, and, secondly, of texts which teach the necessity of unity.

There is a certain parity between the old and the new law. God is the author of both, and one system is confessedly preparatory to the other. "Think not," said our blessed Lord, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."*

Before the coming of Christ, the Jewish Church was the Church of God, and there was none other upon earth. "To them belonged the adoption of children, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises."† But the whole Jewish system was constructed on the principle of a rigid, even a national unity. Other nations could only be admitted as proselytes, and in such a way that the exclusiveness of communion could not be affected. Almighty God protected and blessed this Church, even after the lapse of ten tribes, and never ceased to regard it as His own, until the new revelation of Christ had taken its place. Even our Lord was in all respects obedient to it, fulfilling

* S. Mat. v. 17. † Rom., ix. 4.

all the precepts of the law which, while it stood, was God's ordinance. "You adore that which you know not," said He to the woman of Samaria; "we adore that which we know; for salvation is of the Jews."*

Now the Scriptures tell us that Christ set up a system to take the place of the Jewish, and to accomplish that which it was only able to shadow forth. We should, therefore, be prepared to expect the establishment of an organization as rigidly one as was that which preceded. In accordance with this expectation, we find Him gathering together a company of believers, out of which He chose twelve apostles, to whom He gave the most important powers. The faithful were subordinated to the apostles, and they in turn were under the leadership of one of their own number. This is quite plain, from the fact that they were sent to teach all nations, and received power to govern those whom they made converts to the truths of Christianity. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teach-

* S. John, iv. 22.

ing them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."*

"It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."† "I will not now call you servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doth. But I have called you friends; because all things whatsoever I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you. You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and appointed you, that you should go and should bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain."‡ "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."§

That S. Peter occupied a peculiar place among the apostles, is more than evident from the whole of the sacred history. Our Lord gave him his name of "rock," which showed that although the others were with him the foundations of the Church, he had nevertheless a special pre-eminence. He was in truth as a matter of

* S. Mat. xxviii. 19–20.
† S. John, xv. 15, 16.
‡ Ibid., x. 20.
§ Ibid., xx. 23.

fact the leader of the twelve, and the first on every occasion, both before and after our Lord's death. He received the keys of the kingdom of heaven; he was commissioned to feed the whole flock of Christ; he guided the deliberations of the apostles in the formation of the infant Church. "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."* "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these? Feed My lambs. Feed My sheep."† In the days of expectation, preceding the coming of the Holy Ghost, he guided the apostles who were with him to the election of Matthias in place of Judas.‡ S. Paul, after his miraculous conversion, seeks the counsel of S. Peter before beginning his ministry. "Three years after I came to Jerusalem to see Peter, and stayed with him fifteen days."§

* S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.
† S. John, xxi. 15–17.
‡ Acts, i. 13–26.
§ Gal. i. 18.

So far then as the formation of the Church is concerned, the Scriptures give us abundant evidence of the care which our Lord took to provide for and preserve unity. One doctrine was taught and one government was established, the subversion of which would necessarily have been the destruction of the whole fabric of Christianity.

The texts to which we are now going to refer, are of two classes, those which, under different names by which the Church is called, imply the existence and necessity of unity, and secondly, those which teach in direct words that the body of believers is *one* both morally and visibly.

1. The very word church implies an organization essentially one. Such is the natural meaning of the term, and the context of Scripture leaves no rational room for doubt. This word is used many times in the Gospels, and in the epistles, and proves the existence of the association called by that name, with prerogatives it could not have had, if it had not been one. Thus our Lord, speaking of an offending brother, says, "If he will not hear them, that is, his brethren, tell it to the Church; and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

heathen and the publican."* It would be impossible to tell the Church if there were any doubt where to find it, or any question as to its authority.

Throughout the Acts of the Apostles we read of persecutions against the Church under circumstances which leave no doubt of its unity.† Wherever the word is used (and we cannot here quote every passage), it is employed with a distinct signification. Had there been many churches, it would have been necessary to specify one in particular, or the meaning of the sacred writer could not be clear. Thus St. Paul writes to St. Timothy in words which express not only the oneness of the Church, but also its office of preserving the Christian doctrine. "These things I write to thee, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."‡

The various names by which the Church is called are an unanswerable argument in our favor, since they express in the strongest manner its essential unity.

* S. Mat. xviii. 17. † See Acts, ii. 42, viii. 1, ix. 31, xii. 1–5.
‡ 1 E. S. Tim. iii. 15.

Our Lord calls it a sheepfold under the guidance of one shepherd. "I am the good shepherd, and I know My sheep, and Mine know Me. And other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be made one fold and one shepherd."*

The Church is more commonly called by the name of kingdom than by any other term, and it is a favorite expression with our Blessed Lord, yet it would be difficult to conceive of an appellation implying a more strict unity. A kingdom is one government under one head, and disunion is its destruction. We have a divine argument on this point. "Every kingdom divided against itself shall be brought to desolation, and a house upon a house shall fall."† How does then the name kingdom belong to the body of believers, if they are not one? Now our Divine Master says to His apostles, and at the most solemn moment, even after the institution of the Holy Sacrament, "I appoint to you, as My Father hath appointed to Me, a kingdom."‡

If we were to search for a comparison ex-

* S. John, x. 14–16. † S. Luke, xi. 17. ‡ Ib. xxii. 29.

pressing the absolute necessity of unity, perhaps we could find nothing more forcible than that of a vine and its branches. The branches are a part of the vine, deriving their life from the common trunk, and dying by separation. "As a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you unless you abide in Me. I am the vine, you are the branches."* These words are to be taken in connection with the whole discourse of which they form a part, and cannot refer, therefore, to a moral unity simply, because our Lord dwells especially upon the visible unity of His followers, and as a means of the conversion of the world. He likens that unity to the union subsisting between Himself and the eternal Father. "That they may all be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in thee, that they may be one as we also are one."†

A building or house has, of necessity, a compactness and unity which cannot be disturbed, yet such is the similitude by which St. Paul designates the Church. "Now you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of

* S. John, xv. 4, 5. † Ib. xvii. 21, 22.

God; built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."* Our Saviour speaks in the same language when, as we have seen, He calls St. Peter a rock, and says that He will build His Church on him, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it.

But there is no oneness, of which we have any knowledge, more striking than that of the human body, animated as it is by one principle of life. So St. Paul argues: "As the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body. For the body also is not one member, but many. If the foot should say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear should say, because I am not the eye I am not of the body, is it therefore not of the body? If they were all one member, where would be the body? But now there are many

* Ephesians, ii. 19–21.

members, indeed, yet one body. God hath tempered the body together, giving the more abundant honor to that which wanted it, that there might be no schism in the body, but that the members might be mutually careful one of another. Now you are the body of Christ, and members of member."* Again, speaking to the Ephesians of the relation of Christ to the Church, he says: "He hath put all things under His feet, and made Him head over all the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him, who is filled all in all."†

"For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. He is the saviour of His body. Christ loved the Church, and delivered up Himself for it that He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing. No man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the Church. For we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones."‡

* 1 E. Cor. xii. 12–27. † Ephes. i. 22, 23. ‡ Ib. v. 23–30.

"And He is before all, and by Him all things consist; and He is the head of the body, the Church."*

If the Church be not, by the plan of its Divine Founder, as truly one as the human body is in its organization, the comparison of the inspired writer will fail of reality, and it can in no just sense be called the body of Christ.

2. We proceed now to quote some passages which teach in direct words the unity of the Church. We shall first produce those which show the oneness of faith, and secondly, those which express the necessity of visible unity.

Hear St. Paul writing to the Galatians: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach to you a gospel beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so say I now again, if any one preach to you a gospel beside that which you have received, let him be anathema."†

We shall continue our quotations from other epistles. "Only let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ; that whether when I come and see you, or be absent, I may hear of

* Coloss. i. 17, 18. † Gal. i. 8, 9.

you that you stand fast in one spirit, with one mind laboring for the faith of the gospel."* "Fulfil ye my joy that you be of one mind, having the same charity, being of one accord, agreeing in sentiment."†

"If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor hath the Church of God."‡

"But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be lying teachers among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction."§ "You, therefore, brethren, knowing these things before, beware, lest being led away by the error of the unwise, you fall from your own steadfastness."‖

"Let that which you have heard from the beginning abide in you. If what you have heard from the beginning shall abide in you, you shall also abide in the Son and in the Father."¶

"We are of God. He that knoweth God heareth us. He that is not of God heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."**

* Phil. i. 27. † Ib. ii. 2. ‡ 1 Cor. xi. 16.
§ 2 S. Peter, ii. 1. ‖ Ib. iii. 17. ¶ 1 E. S. John, ii. 24.
** 2 E. S. John, iv. 6.

"Whosoever recedeth, and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God; he that continueth in the doctrine, he hath both the Father and the Son. If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God save you. For he that saith to him, God save you, communicateth with his wicked works."*

All these passages teach with sufficient plainness the oneness of Christian doctrine, and that the apostles considered it of vital importance that it should be preserved unchanged in spite of all dangers from without or within the Church.

To make it quite evident that the unity of which the Scriptures speak is not simply a moral unity, but that of one visible fold, it is only necessary, after all the quotations now given, to produce one or two passages. The prayer of our Lord before His death for the church which He had gathered together, dwells especially upon the danger of division, and supplicates for its visible unity, as almost essential to the end of its organization. He could not have spoken of a mere moral oneness, because of this the

* 2 E. S. John, ix. 10.

world at large can take no cognizance. "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as we also are. While I was with them I kept them in Thy name. Those whom Thou gavest Me I have kept: and none of them hath perished except the son of perdition, that the Scripture may be fulfilled. And now I come to Thee, and these things I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves. I have given them Thy word, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, as I also am not of the world. I do not ask that Thou take them out of the world, but that Thou preserve them from evil. Sanctify them in truth, Thy word is truth. As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also have sent them into the world. And for them do I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth. And not for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in Me. That they all may be one, as Thou, Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me I have given them,

that they may be one, as we also are one. I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in One, and that the world may know that Thou has sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou hast also loved Me."*

In like manner St. Paul writes to the Ephesians in language parallel to our Lord's, and scarcely capable of being misunderstood. "I, therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called,—careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your vocation. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all."† Can there be any reasonable doubt as to the meaning of the apostle? If the unity of God can be misunderstood, then the unity of faith can be called in question. If there be but one God, then there is but one body, one confession, one baptism, and "one Spirit, by whom we are baptized into the one body."

* S. John, xvii. 11–23. † Ephes. iv. 1–6.

IV.

It only remains to briefly state the argument from history, which must have its weight with every one. We have already alluded to the demonstration which experience has given of the necessity of Christian unity, and the sad consequences of discord. But there is a certain prescription in the almost universal confession of One Faith up to the time of the Reformation. That which was known as Christianity for fourteen centuries, had preserved the compactness of one visible body, and although there were heresies and divisions, they only served to render the lines of truth more distinct, and to cut off the erring member from the fellowship of Christ's body. The argument, as we put it, runs thus: Until the movement which resulted in Protestantism, and which is comparatively of recent date, all who called themselves Christians believed in the necessity of a rigid unity, and this is a sufficient proof that such was the teaching of the Divine Founder of Christianity. For, from what other source could they have received a doctrine so universal both as to time and place?

The fathers of the Catholic Church may be taken as witnesses to the faith of the Christian body, of which they were prominent members.

S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 69, thus writes to the Church at Philadelphia:

"As many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, these are with the bishop, and as many as shall repent and turn to the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, my brethren: whosoever followeth one that createth schism, he inheriteth not the kingdom of God."

S. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons in the second century:

"God will also judge those who cause schism; men destitute of the love of God, and who have in view their own interest, but not the oneness of the Church; and who, on account of slight and exaggerated causes, rend and divide, and as as far as in them lies, destroy the great and glorious body of Christ; men who have peace on their lips but war in their actions. But no corruption can be effected by them so great as

is the perniciousness of schism."—*Tract against Heresies, Book IV., Chap. 33d.*

S. Clement of Alexandria, A. D. 200:

"From what has been said, it is, I think, plain that the true Church is one, that which is truly ancient, in which are enrolled all who are just according to God's purpose. The one Church, then, is associated to the nature of the One; which Church these men violently attempt to divide into many heresies. In substance, in sentiment, in origin, in excellence, we say that the ancient and Catholic Church is alone. But the excellence of the Church, like the principle of every thing concrete, is in unity, surpassing all other things, and having nothing similar or equal to itself."—*Strom., Lib. VI.*

S. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, A. D. 250.

"Heresies and schisms are the devil's inventions, wherewith to subvert faith, to corrupt truth, and rend unity. Those whom he cannot detain in the blindness of the old way, he circumvents and deceives by misleading them on their new journey. He snatches men from out the Church itself. This is the result as long as

men have not recourse to the source of truth, nor seek the head, nor keep the doctrine of the heavenly Father, which, whosoever will consider and examine, for him there is no need of a lengthened treatise and much argument. Proof is ready for belief in a short statement of the truth. The Lord says unto Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not vanquish it, and to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' (S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.) And again, to the same, after His resurrection, 'Feed My sheep.' Upon that one man He builds His Church, and to him He assigns His sheep to be fed. And although to all the apostles after His resurrection, He gives an equal power, and says, 'As My Father hath sent Me, I also send you' (S. John, xx. 21), yet in order to manifest unity He has by His own authority so placed the origin of that same unity, as that it begins from one. Certainly the other apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal fellowship of honor and power, but the commencement proceeds from unity, and the primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, and the See one. And they are

all shepherds, yet the flock is shown to be one, such as may be fed by all the apostles with unanimous agreement, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, which one Church, in the Canticle of Canticles, the Holy Spirit designates in the person of Christ, and says, 'My dove, my spotless one, is but one; she is the only one of her mother, elect of her that bare her.' (Cant. vi. 9.) He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, he who abandons the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church was founded, does he feel confident that he is in the Church?

"Seeing that the blessed apostle Paul also teaches this same thing, and shows the sacrament of unity in these words, 'One body and one Spirit, one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God' (Eph. iv. 4), this unity we should hold and vindicate firmly, especially we bishops, who preside in the Church, in order that we may approve the episcopate itself one and undivided. Let no one deceive the brotherhood by falsehood, no one corrupt the truth of faith by faithless prevarication. The episcopate is one, a complete part of which

is held by each bishop. The Church, too, is one, though extended far and wide, and is further multiplied by the increase of her fruitfulness. As the sun has rays many, yet one light; and the tree boughs many, yet its strength is one, resting on the firmly-clinging roots; and as when many streams flow down from one fountain-head, though a multiplicity of waters may seem to be diffused from the bountifulness of the overflowing abundance, yet is unity preserved in the common source. Part a ray of the sun from its orb, this division of light the unity allows not; break a branch from the tree, once broken, it can bud no more; cut the stream from its source, the remnant dries up.

"Thus the Church, flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays through the whole world, yet the light is one which is spread over every place, while its unity of body is preserved. In the luxuriance of her plenty, she stretches her branches over the universal earth, and spreads out far and wide her bountiful and onward streams. Yet is there one head and one source, and one mother abundant in the results of her fruitfulness. It is of her that we are born, with her milk are we nourished; her

breath is our life. The spouse of Christ cannot become adulterated; she is undefiled and chaste. She owns but one home; with spotless purity she guards the sanctity of one chamber. She keeps us for God; she appoints unto a kingdom the sons she has borne. Whosoever having separated from the Church, is joined to an adulteress, he is cut off from the promises of the Church. Neither shall he come unto the rewards of Christ, who leaves the Church of Christ. He is an alien; he is profane; he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for a father, who has not the Church for a mother. If any one was able to escape without the ark of Noah, then he can escape who is out of doors beyond the Church. The Lord warns, and says, 'He that is not with Me, is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth.' He who breaks the peace and concord of Christ's Church, does so against Christ. He who gathers elsewhere than in the Church, scatters the Church of Christ. The Lord says, 'I and the Father are one;' and again, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is written, 'And these three are one.' And does any one believe that this unity, thus proceeding from the divine immutability,

and cohering in heavenly sacraments, can be rent asunder in the Church, and be split by the divorce of antagonist wills? He who holds not this unity, holds not the law of God, holds not the faith of Father and Son, holds not life and salvation.

"Neither let certain persons deceive themselves by a vain interpretation, in that the Lord has said, 'Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in My name, I am with them.' Corrupters of the Gospel, and false interpreters, they lay down what follows, and omit what goes before, giving heed to part, while part they deceitfully suppress. 'If,' saith He, 'two of you shall agree together on earth.' Yet how can he be at agreement with others, who is at disagreement with the body of the Church itself, and with the universal brotherhood? How can two or three be gathered together in Christ's name, who are manifestly separated from Christ and His Gospel? For we did not go out from them, but they went out from us. And as heresies and schisms have a later birth, when men set up different conventicles for themselves, they have left the head and origin of truth. When, therefore, He sets it forth in His precepts, and

says, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My name, I am with them.' He who instituted and made the Church, does not divide men from the Church, but rebuking the faithless with their discord, and by His voice commending peace to the faithful, He shows that He is rather with two or three who pray with one mind, than with many persons who are in dissent, and that more can be obtained by the concordant prayer of a few, than from the discordant prayer of many.

"What peace then can they promise themselves, who are foes to the brethren? What sacrifices do they believe they celebrate, who are rivals of the priests? Or do they think that Christ is with them when gathered together, though gathered out of Christ's Church? Such men, even if killed for the confession of His name, not even by blood is this stain washed out. Inexpiable and heavy is the guilt of discord, nor is it cleansed away by any suffering. He cannot be a martyr, who is not in the Church. He cannot attain to the kingdom, who leaves her to whom the kingdom shall be given. They cannot dwell with God, who have refused to be of one mind in God's Church. Though they be

given over to be burned in fire and flame, or lay down their lives by being a prey to wild beasts, theirs will not be the crown of faith, but the penalty of faithlessness, not the glorious issue of conscientious courage, but the death of despair."—*De Unitate.*

S. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, A. D. 353:

"Whereas, the Church instituted by our Lord, and settled by the apostles, is one for all men, from which the frantic error of divers impieties has severed itself (and it is undeniable that difference of faith has arisen from the evil of a bad comprehension, seeing that what is read is made to tally rather with their sentiments, than their sentiments made to obey what is read; yet seeing that all these parties are mutually opposed to each other), she may be known not only by her own doctrines, but by those of her adversaries; even so, as while all are adverse to her, to confute the impious erroneousness of them all, by the fact of being alone and one. All heretics, then, advance against the Church, but whilst all mutually overthrow each other, their victory brings them nothing for themselves. For their victory over each other

is the Church's triumph over all."—*De Trinitate, Lib. VII.*

S. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, A. D. 377:

"Christ also declares that they who divide the Lord's Church are moved by a devilish spirit, that thus He might at once comprise the heretics and schismatics of all times, to whom to deny forgiveness; forasmuch as every other sin has for its object individuals, while this is against all men. For they alone who tear in pieces the members of the Church, for which the Lord Jesus suffered and the Holy Ghost has been given to us, seek to render void the grace of Christ."—*De Pœniten., Lib. II.*

S. Siricius, Pope of Rome, A. D. 384:

"Let one Eve be the mother of all the living, and one Church the parent of all Christians."—*Epistle CXXIII.*

S. Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 397:

"Nothing so provokes God as the division of the Church. Even though we may have done ten thousand good things, yet shall we, if we

cut to pieces the fulness of the Church, suffer no less a punishment than they that mangled His body. For that happened for the benefit of the world, though not done with that intention, but this has no advantage in any case, but much is the injury. A certain holy man (S. Cyprian) said something that seems to be a bold thing, but yet he spoke it out. Now what is this? He declared that not even the blood of martyrdom was able to blot out this sin.—Know you not what Core, Dathan, and Abiron suffered? What they alone? Rather is it not what they also who were with them? What sayest thou? 'The faith is the same, these men also are orthodox.' Why then are they not with us? One Lord, one faith, one baptism. If their cause is good, ours is evil; but if ours is good, theirs is evil."—*XI. Hom. in Ep. ad Ephes.*

S. Augustin, Bishop of Hippo, A. D. 390:

"We have, therefore, to inquire here who has charity: you will find it is they alone who love unity. That Church assuredly is one which our ancestors called the Catholic, that they might show by the name itself that it is throughout the whole (*quia per totum est*). But this

Church is the body of Christ, as the apostle says: 'For His body, which is the Church' (Coloss. i. 24); whence, assuredly, it is manifest that he who is not in the members of Christ cannot have Christian salvation. Now, the members of Christ are united to each other by the charity of unity, and by the same cohere to their own Head, which is Christ Jesus."—*L. II., contr. Litter Petitiani, et De Unitate Eccles.*

S. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 412:

"It is therefore unlawful and a profanation, and an act the punishment of which is death, to love to associate with unhallowed heretics, and to unite one's self to their communion; for they sacrifice out of the holy tabernacle the victim which is offered for sins, and do not perform the sacred sacrifice within the holy places. For the Church is one, even as there was also one tabernacle of old, and one tabernacle which pointed out in a type the beauty of the Church." *In. Levit.* xvii. 3, *L. I.*

Gelasius, Pope, A. D. 492:

"That by this spectacle it may be manifest to all men that the Church of Christ is truly

one throughout all its parts, and indivisible; a Church which, knit together by the bond of concord, and the admirable woof of charity, might be shown to be the one coat of Christ, seamless throughout, which not even the soldiers who crucified Christ would dare divide." —*Ep.* viii.

LECTURE SECOND.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF UNION UNDER THE THEORY OF PROTESTANTISM.

"Every good tree yieldeth good fruit, and the bad tree yieldeth bad fruit."—S. MATTHEW, vii. 17.

HAVING seen the necessity of unity among Christians, we proceed to our second point, and purpose to make it evident that under the Protestant theory such unity is absolutely impossible. Our plan will naturally be to examine, in all fairness, the theory of Protestantism, and then to show how it destroys all oneness of doctrine, and consequently all visible unity.

This theory is, if we understand it rightly, that every thing which concerns faith and salvation must be left to the private judgment of each individual; that there is and can be no external authority which has power to bind the conscience, and which believing men are bound to obey. Upon this theory the first Protestants

acted in separating themselves from the Christianity received for centuries, and upon the same principle their successors have continued to act in forming new churches, and framing new articles of faith. If there had been to them an exterior authority, they would not have been justified in their own consciences for disregarding it; if they had not thought themselves free to exercise their own judgment, they could not have excused themselves from sin in the course they adopted. We ourselves have heard the right of private judgment claimed by Protestants, all our lives, and have always been taught to consider it as the essential feature of Protestantism.

The Catholic Church by no means interferes with the use of reason in its proper sphere. On the contrary, as revelation is addressed to intelligence, it must be addressed to reason, and we are to judge of the motives of faith, and the proofs of the revelation made known to us. But the one thing which reason demands is the evidence that God, who cannot deceive, nor be deceived, has spoken, or is speaking to us. When this is proved, we cannot refuse to hear what God says, unless we are faithless to the

very first instincts of reason itself. If God be not true, then where is truth?

But there is a vast difference between judging of the proof of a revelation, the credentials of an external authority which speaks to man, and making ourselves the judges of the doctrines revealed. In the one case we only ask to know if it be really our Creator who either immediately or mediately holds communication with us; in the other, we subject the words of God, or His messenger, to the scrutiny of our finite wisdom, and count ourselves free to accept or reject that which we hear. We shall examine again this point when we come to notice the claims of the Catholic Church. Here we only refer to it, lest any one should think that there is no scope for reason under our system. The question is not as to the exercise of private judgment on the proofs of a revelation, but on the matter revealed. If we do not mistake the theory of Protestantism, it leaves all dogmas open to free inquiry, and asks no one to believe any thing which his own individual reason does not approve. The Catholic Church gives to all ample proofs of her divine mission, and then simply says that all are bound to re-

ceive her teachings. Even though they may seem to be unreasonable at first sight, they cannot really be so, because God, the author and light of reason, cannot be inconsistent with Himself. The Protestant denies that there is any external authority having power over his conscience, and, consequently, claims for himself the right to choose out of all he sees and hears that which he thinks credible, and which accordingly he accepts. Thus he is at liberty to join himself to a visible body of professing Christians, or to be untrammelled by any, to change at any time the creed which he has adopted, if there be to him a sufficient reason, or if he intellectually grows out of the system in which he has lived. We honestly state this as the Protestant theory, believing that upon it all intelligent Protestants have acted, and that they will in no way dispute our statements.

We will then endeavor to show that with such as accept this theory, unity is an impossibility.

1. If the subject-matter of belief be left to every one's mind, there can be no agreement; and as there can be no unity of faith, so there will be no visible unity. Men are so differently

constituted, that they cannot think alike, nor even see the same things in the same manner. The demonstrations of mathematics may be admitted by all mankind, but these are axioms of abstract science, about which the reason is hardly free. A thing cannot be, and not be, at the same moment. No one is free to refuse this proposition, because it admits of no denial. Yet in things which are open to the choice of human judgment, and about which there is no certainty, there is no agreement among men, and none can be expected. Where one man has as good a right to think for himself as another, there can be no dogmatism. One cannot say to the other, you ought to see things as I do, for in so saying he would convict himself of an inconsistency. The right he claims for himself he ought to vindicate for his neighbor, for otherwise he loses it for himself. One man may know more than another, but his increased knowledge gives him no liberty to intrude into the domain of another's intelligence. In things which are matters of pure speculation there is no unity among thinking minds, and there never will be. Admit, then, that in matters of Christian faith each individual is free to believe

only that which may seem concordant with his reason, and because it is so concordant, and you have the end of all unity. How can it be otherwise? All cannot see alike, and who has the right to dogmatize? In fact, who can know which is right and which is wrong among discordant opinions? If there are contradictions, all cannot be right, but there is no one to tell us how to know the truth. The moment any individual or sect claims the liberty to dictate to others, it vitiates the theory by which alone it has any power to act. Facts in the history of Protestantism prove all we have asserted. Have not all the original pioneers in the reformed movement been lost sight of in the multitude of their successors? Is there any Protestant body which at this day holds the original confession, the creed of Augsburg, for example? Is there a single Protestant Church which holds now the articles of belief under which it was at first organized? These variations are too many for the subject of one lecture. The learned and acute Bossuet has filled a large volume with an account of them. Yet they are perfectly legitimate, the natural consequence of the original principles, and there is no power to stay them.

They must go on till every mind is satisfied. A Church is formed of such as agree to think alike on certain points. The members coming together freely, have also the right to separate whenever they choose, and the moment there is a shade of difference, to leave the organization and form others. And this process will go on, as it has gone on, by almost a geometrical progression; and it often happens, as we ourselves have seen, that among the members of the same Church there is great diversity of opinion, so that the creed is practically lost sight of. Where can there be any logical corrective to this state of things? By-and-by one man denies the divinity of the very Founder of Christianity. You cannot say to him that he is wrong; you can only tell him, I think you are in error, and I cannot agree with you. Another man sits down on his chair and fancies he has communication with spirits, good, bad, or indifferent, and learns that all creeds are delusions. It is not possible to deny his right to think and believe as he chooses, as long as you claim the same liberty for yourself. Every species of new opinion stands secure upon this foundation, and cannot be overcome. The Mormon on the

plains of Utah is only exercising the privilege which every Protestant sect, without exception, claims for itself. It has even come to this, that men erecting, by the aid of the natural law, a standard of morality in their own minds, openly confess that it matters not what a man believes, provided that his heart be right. And such is the common conviction among Protestants, since they generally agree that one has as good a chance of salvation as another, provided he be guilty of no crime. There is not one of their sects, as far as we know, which consistently maintains that the belief of any particular doctrine is necessary to salvation, and they all find fault with the Catholic Church for doing so, accusing us of bigotry or exclusiveness.

2. There can be no unity of belief, unless there be an admitted standard of truth, and under the theory we are examining, such a standard cannot be found. This is a most important point, and presents an argument which is unanswerable. Certainly it will be accorded that if men are to come together and be of one mind as to religious doctrine, they must do it by the force of some authority which they all recognize. They will not agree unless

they feel that they ought to do so, and no such duty can be shown them unless it appears that God has spoken, and that there is an infallible voice or standard of truth. Now, under the theory of Protestantism what standard can there be? If any be claimed, it is in violation of the original principle of private judgment, and strikes a blow at the whole system. How, in one breath, claim the right to think as you choose, and in the next deny that right by asserting an authority which infringes upon that liberty? One does not see how there can consistently be any Protestant creed which shall be imposed by any Church upon mankind. Let us, however, review briefly what may be offered in this light as the substitute or semblance of an authority by which unity might be effected among men.

In the first place it cannot be that any Church shall be such an authority; for, according to the doctrines of all the reformed bodies, a Church has no authority except that given to it by the members. As then the members are not infallible, the Church cannot be, and if not infallible, can have no power to bind any one. Some Protestants admit that some kind of a

Church is necessary, but none believe that any one in particular is, and all deny that any Church is infallible. They say that the Catholic Church has erred, and that all Churches are liable to error. Some admit no visible Church at all, but say that all good people throughout the world form the invisible Church. The Church of England, which seems to claim more authority than any other Protestant organization, says distinctly that the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome have erred in matters of faith, and asserts that the Scriptures are the ultimate authority as interpreted by the individual. Thus reads the sixth of the thirty-nine articles, if we do not misunderstand it: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." That the individual is constituted the interpreter of the Bible, appears by the twentieth article, wherein it is stated that the "Church may not ordain any thing contrary to God's word, nor so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

Who is the judge, therefore, as to the question whether a doctrine be repugnant to Scripture or not? Surely not the Church which ordains it, but the individual to whom the doctrine is proposed. And of what worth as a teacher is a Church that can thus contradict the written word of God, and commit itself to error? And, finally, if the Church be not infallible, it can have no authority to bind the conscience, or impose articles of belief. By the universal confession of all Protestants, there is no such infallible Church, and therefore no such standard of truth.

It is however claimed by some that the Bible is the authority which has sufficient force to bind together the various individuals who accept it as the word of God, and that by means of this common standard unity can be obtained. To this, history replies that the Scriptures, subjected to private interpretation, have never been able to effect any agreement whatever; that men have divided and subdivided on the very meaning of the sacred text, until even all accord as to essentials has been lost. Let us examine this whole subject in the spirit of candor, and in an earnest desire for truth.

Before the Holy Scriptures are taken as an authority, it must be settled that they are what they profess to be. Two questions have to be answered. Are the sacred books authentic, that is, were they really written by those whose names they bear? Secondly, are they inspired, so as to have any thing more than a human authority? The first question might possibly be answered by patient investigation, though it would be attended with no little difficulty, and very few would be able to examine the matter for themselves. The majority would have to take on trust the historical researches of others. There are many apocryphal books which bear a close resemblance to those generally received, and it is no easy matter, at this day, to decide between the true and the false. We are quite convinced that this question has never been thoroughly answered by the Protestant leaders; that they have never well settled the authenticity of the Scriptures; that commonly, in opposition to their own theory, they take the decision of the Catholic Church, or the opinions of those who have gone before them. This they really have no right to do, for the whole matter ought to be subjected to the judgment of each

individual, and no one is obliged to accept the conclusions of another in a point so vital to religion, especially when no one professes to be certain.

If, however, the sacred books be admitted to be authentic, how can they be proved to be inspired? Inspiration itself is a thing hard to be understood, and admits of a variety of explanations. The least that can be said of a book claiming to be inspired is that God speaks in and through it. To establish this, some infallible testimony is required, some word that shall have the authority of God Himself. Can any evidence of less weight prove such a point? To establish the authority of a message claiming to be divine, we naturally require the sure proof of miracles, or at least the voice of an infallible teacher. Now, where is this external testimony to the inspiration of the Scriptures? The teaching of the Catholic Church will not be admitted; and apart from this, where is there any proof sufficient? Universal reception cannot be pleaded, because this would not make the Scriptures divine, and, moreover, there has been no such universal reception.

In the Church the Canonical books were

indeed received, but they were not collected for some time. The Council of Laodicea, A. D. 365, the first which mentions them, leaves out the Apocalypse, and does not give a perfect list. After the Reformation, several books counted in the Canon were rejected by the Reformed Churches, as well as certain passages of other books still retained. To the Protestant mind, then, there has been no universal reception; and even if there had been, it would not prove the divinity of the Scriptures. No one is forced to believe what others have believed, unless it be demonstrated that God has interposed with His authority, and then the veracity of God is the ground of faith, and not the consent of mankind.

We have heard, also, that the inspiration of the Bible can be proved by internal testimony, that is, by the evidence which its contents bear, that they are divine. Yet this is an argument good only for those who are willing to admit it. And will men agree that the books embraced in King James' version are inspired? Do just these books, and no more and no less, bear to every man the internal evidence that they are the word of God? Such is not experience

Many find great objections to many parts of the Old Testament, while Luther thought the epistle of St. James very unevangelical. Every man must be the judge of the inspiration of the whole Bible, or of its different parts, and here one man's opinion is as good as another's. There are no doubt many who receive the Scriptures without any examination of the evidence required. This they can do, but their conduct in the matter is no rule for others, since no one is required to believe any thing without good and sufficient reason. If they believe without evidence capable of satisfying any candid mind, we do not question their right to do so, but we do deny that they have a reasonable faith. It would be very illogical to attempt to prove the Scriptures by the Scriptures, or one book by another. St. Paul indeed says, that "all Scripture divinely inspired is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice."* And St. Peter testifies, that "the prophecy came not by the will of man at any time, but the holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost."† Therefore "no Scripture is made by

* 2 E. Timothy, iii. 16. † 2 S. Peter, i. 20, 21.

private interpretation." If these passages were made to apply to the Old Testament, they could with difficulty be interpreted of the New, much less of the book of which they form a part. And it is necessary to establish the inspiration of these very texts before they can be taken in evidence. For ourselves, we are perfectly sincere and honest when we say that we have never heard from any Protestant source a good argument for the inspiration of the Bible, and we do not believe that any can be presented.

Let us, however, accept, without any proof, the assertion that the Scriptures, as they are commonly received, are the word of God. Even then, on the theory of private judgment, we are no nearer unity than before. Subjected to each man's interpretation, they cannot be a rule of faith. Every reader is entitled to his own opinion, and men have not agreed, and will continue to differ, and no one can consistently infringe the liberty of another, or claim unerring certainty for his own deductions. The Bible is by no means easy to be understood. It certainly contains many difficulties. Many things which the majority of Protestants accept are hardly contained in it at all, while there seem

to be very plain revelations which are instantly rejected. Infant baptism and the observance of the Lord's day are generally received by the churches of the reformation, yet it would be hard to prove either by Scripture alone.

The primacy of St. Peter, the real presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, the power of the priesthood to forgive sin, are expressed almost in the plainest words,* yet they are denied, and ingenious efforts are made to explain away the sacred text. Of those who interpret the Scripture so differently, which is right? Nor can it be said that there is agreement in essentials, for such is not the case, since there is agreement in no one thing. Then who can say what are the essentials? If any thing be termed essential, surely the divinity of Jesus Christ ought to be, and there are many who deny this, and cannot see it in the Bible. If we were to collect the points accepted by all the Protestant churches as the teaching of Holy Scripture, we should have a very small creed, if indeed we could have any at all. The Holy Scriptures, interpreted by the individual, are in truth no

* See S. Matt., xvi. 18, 19; xxvi. 26-8. S. John, xx. 21-3.

rule of faith; and the fact that among the sects which hold this theory there are all possible shades of diversity, and continually widening differences, is a sufficient evidence that unity among them can never be reached.

But we have by no means exhausted the subject. After the Bible is admitted as an inspired book, there comes the question of a translation, and the still more difficult comparison of the original manuscripts. For this latter work very few people in the world are competent, and yet every one ought to be satisfied that in so important a point there is no deception. Not one person in a thousand can read the languages in which the Scriptures were written, so as to be able to judge if the translation be correct or not. Surely the translation is not inspired. All that can be said of it is that it is a true expression of the thought contained in the original. Yet we have often heard people speak and argue as if the very version of King James were inspired. Such an unreasonable doctrine is surely not seriously intended, but it is very often acted upon. It is true that the translation of King James has generally been received by the reformed bodies, yet this accord is fast passing

away, and new translations are being made. It is quite possible that ere long every Protestant sect will have its own Bible, and this is a liberty which, by their own principles, they have a right to claim.

The opinion of the majority is advanced by some as a standard of truth, and it is asserted that the minority ought to follow the conclusions of the majority. Is this, however, a correct principle, so true that it should be of universal application? Are the majority of men always right? Were they right when heathenism covered the world with its dark mantle, and the followers of the true God were confined to one nation? The greater number of mankind do not profess, at this day, the religion of Christ. Are they right, and we in the wrong? Or is the principle only to be applied to those who call themselves Christians? Then the Catholic Church must be heard, for she by far outnumbers all others. Or is it only meant that the majority of Protestants are to be followed? Then we shall have great difficulty in finding what this majority is, and what doctrines it adopts, how it speaks, and how the unlettered are to hear its voice. We would not venture to

undertake such an investigation for ourselves, and as there is constant change, the inquiry would have to be renewed every day. Finally, the whole theory is inconsistent with the groundwork of Protestantism, which leaves every man free to think as he pleases on due reflection.

A similar difficulty attends the proposition to make antiquity the standard of belief. It might be plausibly argued that what Christians in the ages all along have professed is certainly the truth. This cannot, however, be maintained by any one of the offsprings of the Reformation, since that movement was a direct rejection of antiquity. If we refer to a source which we condemn as unworthy of credit, how shall our arguments be accepted? If antiquity be an authority in one thing, it is in all things. If it shows, for example, that anciently the mystery of the Holy Trinity was held, it also shows the constant confession of the unity of the Church. If it declares the necessity of a ministry in things pertaining to God, it proves at the same time the existence of a commissioned priesthood and a divine sacrifice, which is the essential worship of Christians. No, we cannot, under the theory we are examining, make antiquity a

rule; and if we were to do so, it would declare against Protestantism, while even here the majority of men, unable to make any proper inquiry for themselves, would be obliged to put up with the opinions of others.

Finally, there are some who would make the early ages of Christianity the guide, and insist that we ought to follow the opinions of the first disciples of our Lord, and so come to agreement. This is a worse theory than that of antiquity, for it makes the guide we need more inaccessible. What are the early ages, and when do the writers of the Church cease to be primitive? Who shall answer this question with authority, and tell us exactly how far we may trust the ancient Church? There is no one who has any right to answer, and if there were, of what use is the early age to those who live in the nineteenth century, and have generally no means to pursue historical inquiries? Is it really come to this, that the best historian is most likely to find out the truth, that our Lord has left the faith in such a way that the great majority of men can never be certain of it? Consistently, therefore, the larger part of Protestants reject this theory, and see no reason why the early

Church is any more to be obeyed than the Church of later days—no ground whatever for the proposition which makes the primitive days the standard of truth. And if time permitted us, it would be quite curious to show how those who go to the early Church for their belief differ as widely in their conclusions as those who accept the Bible alone. Men are bound to be guided by no authority which is not infallible, and who can pretend to be infallible in his historical investigations? The primitive Church manifested Christ and His truth to the world around itself. That was its office, and if the Redeemer of man has provided no such instrumentality for succeeding ages, it is our misfortune, and human research will not take its place.

3. It appears, then, to be quite evident that unity is an impossibility among those who accept the Protestant principle; but we go further, and honestly declare that all the Churches of the Reformation are bound to give up all dogmatism, and to bind no creeds upon their members. So not only is accord out of the question, but it cannot be claimed to be necessary. And since no article of belief can be imposed on any one's

conscience, all visible unity is at an end. It cannot be said that one doctrine is more necessary than another, or in fact that any one is essential, since each individual has always his right of judgment, which no corporation can take from him. We are driven even to the conclusion adopted by many, that unity is not desirable, that separations promote manliness, increase the thirst for truth, and, by the spirit of emulation which they encourage, advance the true interests of the world. If we were arguing in advance of any facts, we should say that the obligation to unity was denied by the very first movements of the Protestant Reformation, but the history of the last three hundred years speaks louder than any argument. It is really inconsistent with the ground principles of the reform, to even wish for unity among Christians, for the moment you admit that such unity is desirable, you confess the great defect of the Protestant system. If unity be necessary then the whole fabric of dissent must fall to the ground, and its author must be found in the great enemy of human salvation. Good and sincere people, when they pray for union among the disciples of Christ, and meet together to promote such an

end, are implicitly denying the foundation on which they profess to rest their whole creed, and presenting the best argument in favor of the Catholic Church. On the strict logical interpretation of the principle we have examined, there can be no creed to unite men, and no obligation to believe imposed upon any one. It is right to reason from the character of the effects to the character of the cause, from the consequences of any theory to the nature of the theory. A good tree brings forth good fruit, and an evil tree evil fruit. Infidelity, or the rejection of all revealed truth, is the legitimate fruit of the tree of Protestantism, which so widely overspreads our land. The great truths of Christianity are being fast lost sight of, and there is nothing so sacred that men are not free to call it in question. True belief in Christ cannot be perpetuated. The right understanding of the mystery of His incarnation is by no means common, and a very large proportion of Protestants deny His divinity altogether. The once prevalent belief in heaven and hell has been melting away, until pure materialism has become the religion of many, who have faith in nothing but their senses. Under all these cir-

cumstances, it is highly honorable to their manhood, that so many are found to lament the evils of division, as the light of Christianity daily wanes away from them. Let them be in earnest, and consistent. God will enlighten their minds and purify their hearts. They will learn that no mere human power can bind together discordant minds, that no plan of unity proposed by men can succeed, that they must go back to the God of all, who is essentially one, and ask of Him, if He has not, in His wisdom, provided a way to keep man in the one path of truth. There must be something wrong in the strife of those who profess to be followers of the Prince of Peace. Truth can be but one and the same to all mankind, for God is truth, and with Him is no change or shadow of turning. The words of Tertullian, a Christian writer of the second century, are very appropriate to the subject of this lecture:

"Therefore, there must be no appeal to the Scriptures, nor must the contest be constituted in these, in which the victory is either none, or doubtful, or too little doubtful. For even though the debate on the Scriptures should not so turn out, as to confirm each party, the order

of things required that this question should be first proposed, which is now the only one to be discussed, 'To whom belongs the faith itself; whose are the Scriptures; by whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom was that rule delivered, whereby men become Christians?' For wherever the true Christian rule and faith shall be shown to be, there will be the true Scriptures and the true expositions, and all the true Christian traditions. If these things be so, that the truth be adjudged to us, as many as walk according to that rule, which the Church has handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God, the reasonableness of our proposition is manifest, which determines that heretics are not to be allowed to enter upon an appeal to the Scriptures, whom we prove without the Scriptures, to have no concern with the Scriptures."

In like manner, S. Ambrose:

"Learn also hence that Satan transforms himself as it were into an angel of light, and often sets a snare for the faithful by means of the divine Scriptures themselves. Thus does he make heretics, thus weaken faith, thus attack the requirements of piety. Let not, therefore,

the heretic ensnare thee, because he is able to cite a few examples from Scripture; let him not assume to himself an appearance of learning. The devil also uses texts of Scripture, not to teach, but to circumvent and deceive."

LECTURE THIRD.

THE CLAIMS OF PROTESTANTISM.

"They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us."—I. E. S. JOHN, ii. 19.

HAVING seen, in a former lecture, the impossibility of unity under the theory of private judgment, it remains to look more closely at the system of Protestantism in its concrete form, to examine its representatives and their claims, that we may decide the question whether they have any legitimate title to represent Christ upon earth. It will certainly be fair to take the statements of Protestants themselves, and to let the different sects speak in their own name, since they are the best judges of their own pretensions. We shall be obliged to study brevity, while we endeavor to give an analysis of the present condition of what is called the reformed Christianity. Under the general term Protestantism, we comprehend all those who protest, in greater or less degree, against the Catholic

Church, and are followers of the principles of the Reformation. Such is the common acceptation of the term. At the assembly held in Spire, in 1529, the resolution was taken by the majority to put an end to further innovations upon doctrines received until the calling of a general council. The minority protested against this measure, and denied the authority of any ecclesiastical boards or committees to interfere with the freedom of religious belief. Hence, says the American Cyclopedia, the term Protestant has been generally applied to all those who accept the Bible alone as the rule of faith. It is not easy to classify the various sects which, mutually contradicting each other, agree in protesting against the Catholic Church. Luther and his companions were the pioneers in their cause; but very few at the present day retain the opinions of Luther or Calvin. The followers of the original reformers have divided on the question of church government, into Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians; and these have again subdivided on great differences of doctrine. So far as we know, not one of these churches claims exclusively to be the Church of Christ, or assumes that member-

ship with its communion is necessary to salvation. The most that is pretended is, that the system adopted by them is true, and more consonant than other systems with the faith delivered by our blessed Lord. It is not denied that they all have a human origin, owing their existence to some teacher who in his work of reform has believed himself authorized to establish a new order of things. It is tautology, perhaps, to say that the Reformed Churches are all younger than the Reformation, and have sprung from that religious movement. They may claim by doctrine to be in sympathy with the Church of Christ in the early ages, but as external bodies, having a corporate life, they are all of recent origin.

The opinions of Luther suffered many changes before his death, but the doctrines generally ascribed to him are contained in the Confession of Augsburg, drawn up by Melancthon, and presented to the emperor Charles V. in 1530. This document certainly contained many misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine, yet it admitted the action of grace in our justification, the existence of free will, and the real presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. It allowed,

also, the jurisdiction of the pastors of the Church, the practice of confession, and declares that the saints pray to God for us, and that it is a pious practice to venerate their memories, while it neither approves nor condemns their invocation. There are different editions of this Confession, but the above points are embraced in it, and it is quite evident that its authors endeavored to moderate their tone, and soften down as much as possible the opinions opposed to Catholicity.

The Lutheran churches have fallen away from many of the doctrines contained in this Confession, and reject many practices originally adopted. Their principal tenets now are justification by faith alone, total depravity of man, which effectually takes away the freedom of the will, and renders all man's works unacceptable to God in themselves. They hold the Bible to be the only rule of faith, and assert that creeds are of no value except as they are contained substantially in the written word of God. Baptism is deemed ordinarily necessary, and their doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, which was at first a kind of consubstantiation, seems to deny any real presence of Christ at all. Confession, though originally admitted, has fallen into desue-

tude. They do not believe in any distinction between laymen and clergymen, asserting the ministry to be of human right, and that all the faithful share in the universal priesthood. The grades of bishops, superintendents, or provosts, are all matters of expediency, or regulations adopted by the churches for their better government. Discipline is, indeed, administered by synods and consistories, but all the power which they have is delegated to them by the congregation. According to their own statement they number nearly thirty millions, and are found principally in the German and northern states of Europe. In the United States they are supposed to number about three hundred thousand, but we do not learn that they are increasing much in proportion to the other sects of Protestants.

Calvin was one of the principal founders of the body which bore the name of the Reformed Church, and which began about the middle of the sixteenth century. Its distinguishing tenet was that of unconditional election to salvation. There was also a theological difference upon the sacrament of the Eucharist, after the opinion of Calvin that the presence of Christ is only to be

understood in a spiritual sense. In this respect the Reformed Church approached the teaching of Zuinglius, the distinguished Swiss reformer. The five points embraced in Calvinism are: 1. Unconditional Election; 2. Particular Redemption; 3. Total Depravity; 4. Irresistible Grace; 5. The Perseverance of the Saints. Although the doctrines of Calvin have had their influence in the forming of various kinds of Protestantism, yet they are very few in our day who adopt his whole scheme. During the last fifty years every imaginable form of belief has been tolerated, from the strictest old-school orthodoxy to the loosest rationalism and skepticism. The very liberty claimed by the reformers has led to the constant division of their followers.

The Congregationalists find their origin in the Puritan movement of non-conformity with the Protestant Church of England. The king, as head of the Church, thought to enforce uniformity among his subjects. Many resisted, deeming the ritual of that Church as little better than that of the Catholics, which they had abandoned. They suffered persecution and exile rather than submit. The fathers of the Congregational system are the Rev. Messrs. Brown and Robin-

son. The latter, in 1608, went with large numbers of his followers to Holland, and soon after, in 1620, many with his benediction emigrated to America, where they laid the foundation of their religious system. Their distinctive feature is the independence of each particular congregation, so that the different Churches of their communion make not so much one Church, as a conglomeration of Churches. They agree with the Lutherans in their view of the ministry, and the greater part receive the doctrine of predestinarianism put forth by Calvin. There is, however, much diversity in their views, and a large and very influential party have advanced Pelagian doctrine of late, and deny the depravity of man by reason of the fall. They generally admit two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but they are, in their view, rather edifying and expressive rites, than sacraments, because grace is not necessarily attached to them. They admit fully their recent origin, and do not believe that the claim of antiquity would add any thing to their pretensions. In this system each particular congregation has its own creed, to which, each one on becoming a member, signifies his adhesion. The association

of Churches has no power over the particular creeds of individual Churches. The Congregationalists number about two hundred and fifty thousand in the United States, but are not numerous in any other part of the world.

Other denominations which adopt the same mode of government, with important doctrinal differences, are the Baptists, Unitarians, Universalists, and a large proportion of the Methodists.

The Baptists agree generally with the principles of the Congregationalists, but insist that baptism by immersion is absolutely necessary, and the more strict of them refuse communion to such as have not been immersed. There are as many as ten sects of Baptists in the United States, and, taken together, they form a very numerous body. Their theological differences are upon the observance of the Lord's day, the question of grace and free will, and other similar points. Their origin is undoubtedly in the convulsions of the sixteenth century, and Simon Menno is perhaps one of their principal founders. They do however profess to find traces of their doctrines in certain early heretics, whose principles reappear among the Culdees

of the West, and the Paulians of the East, the Albigenses, and the Waldenses. We would not dishonor them by such parentage, unless it had been claimed for them by some of their own friends. The Waldenses adopted the principle of the private interpretation of the Bible, but they are not older than the twelfth century; while the Albigenses are Manicheans or Gnostics, and hold to dualism, the belief of which has never been common among Protestants. All these sects were condemned by the Church at large, and before the Reformation were considered out of the pale of Christianity.

Unitarianism is the general name for those Protestants who deny the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and assert, in opposition, their view of the absolute unity of God. There were individuals who, in the earlier days of the Church, advanced some of their opinions, but their organization as a religious body is one of the fruits of Protestantism. At first, their opinions found much opposition from the leading reformers, but in the progress of time they have gained a strong foothold among the promoters of the new systems. Their creed is not easily defined, because they disavow all right to frame

or impose authoritative statements of opinion. They deny the divinity of Christ, and believe that the Holy Ghost is only an influence. They have different views in regard to the character and office of our Lord, but all deny that He is God. The atoning power of His sacrifice on the Cross is rejected, and the doctrine of man's fall in Adam is not received. In regard to the Holy Scriptures there is much difference. The early Unitarians held to the inspiration of the Bible, but the later school do not appeal to it, except as to any other book which contains truth, and illustrates the spiritual laws. The government of their Churches is strictly congregational, and they have no established ritualism, no priestly order, and no necessary sacraments. The Lord's Supper is, at the most, only an expressive and affecting rite, and baptism is not indispensable, though many desire it for children as well as adults. They hold, in some degree, to the accountability of man for his actions; but retribution, in their sense, is only the concomitant of sin, and in the next life, which is only a continuation of this, the soul is supposed to complete its spiritual development begun here. They have, therefore, in the just

progress of the reformed opinions, done away with the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, the fall of man, the atonement of our Lord, the sacraments, and effectually with heaven and hell. The Universalists reject the doctrine of eternal punishment, and believe in the final salvation of all mankind. In some respects, their creed corresponds with that of the Unitarians, and in others, with that of the Calvinists. They have made much progress among the followers of the Reformation, and are quite a numerous body in the United States. In their scheme, nothing can be necessary, and they have, therefore, no claims upon mankind. Their organization can only be defended upon social grounds, and for the amelioration of their fellow-men, through the system of morality they have adopted.

The Methodists are a very large and influential body, divided into various sects, and all under congregational government, with the exception of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They owe their existence as a Church to the Rev. John Wesley, a fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, and a minister of the Church of England. Dissatisfied with the low state of religion

around him, he sought to awaken a new spirit of piety, and ended in founding a new religious system. The first regular conference of his adherents was held in 1747. He adopted the thirty-nine articles of the English Church, explaining away, however, the Calvinism of the article on predestination. The Wesleyans maintain the doctrines of original depravity, an unlimited atonement, justification by faith, and a divine assurance of acceptance with God. They are decidedly the largest of all the dissenting bodies of Great Britain, and are still increasing.

The Methodist Protestant Church was formed in the United States, in 1830, by a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church, on account of differences on the question of the ministry and on points of discipline.

The Methodist Wesleyan Connection of America has existed only since 1843. Dissensions on the subject of slavery, church government, and the sale and use of intoxicating drinks, caused this separation from the original body of Methodists, though their religious opinions are substantially the same.

The sects which hold to the government of their churches by presbyters or elders bear the title of Presbyterians. They hold to the distinction between laymen and the ministry as of divine appointment, although they deem no external commission by succession from Christ to be essential. Their discipline is administered by synods of elders, and they lay claim to a striking resemblance to the primitive Church, contending that there is no distinction between bishops and presbyters, and that the bishops spoken of in the New Testament are presbyters elevated to offices more or less responsible. Their doctrines are Calvinistic, and generally of the more rigid school. The Westminster Confession is one of their authorized symbols. Their origin is found in the divisions of the sixteenth century. We first hear of them in Scotland in 1527, where the opposition of the leaders of the reform to prelacy manifested itself very strongly. There, in spite of all the efforts of the crown in favor of Episcopacy, the Presbyterian Church became the established Church of the land. It has not, however, maintained either its unity or its hold upon the people. In 1733, the secession of the Associated Presbytery

took place, and in 1820 the United Secession Church was established. Violent conflicts against the establishment, and eager disputes, have led, in our own day (1833 to 1838), to the disruption of the original body, and the establishment of the Free Church of Scotland, to which belong many of the leading minds of this denomination. The American Presbyterians are an off-shoot from the Church of Scotland, and were settled in this country about the time of the Revolution. They continued the system of their predecessors, but were never very harmonious—some inclining to be very rigid, and others to yield somewhat to the progress of the age. They were finally, in 1837, divided into two parts, called the old and the new school, which terms signify, in some degree, their doctrinal difference. From the original establishment in the United States have seceded the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Associate Reformed Church, and the Associate Presbyterian Church.

The Reformed Dutch Church found its origin in Netherlands, about the middle of the sixteenth century. It was organized after the Genevan Presbyterian model, and its doctrines

are Calvinistic. The Belgic Confession of 1561 is one of its principal symbols. In its early days it had quite a struggle with the Arminians, which resulted in the separation of the party called Remonstrants. At the present time Socinianism and Rationalism prevail, to a great extent, within it, and its former reputation for orthodoxy among Protestants is gone. A branch of this Church was established in America early in the seventeenth century, and found a settlement on Manhattan Island. The original founders, being Dutch, adhered so obstinately to the Dutch language, in all their public services, even in preaching, that the progress of their community was not very rapid. Now they have introduced the English language, but still they are not a very numerous body. Their doctrines are those of Calvin, and are held with more or less rigor, according to circumstances. They have, unlike most Protestant denominations, forms of prayer for administering baptism and the Lord's Supper, and for the ordination of elders and deacons.

The followers of Emmanuel Swedenborg deserve notice in this connection, since they form an influential portion of Protestantism. He

flourished in Sweden from 1688 to 1772, and became the founder of a new system of belief. He teaches, among other things, that there is one God, who is at the same time a divine man. The Scriptures are received only in part, and interpreted in a spiritual sense. The most striking feature of their creed is the belief in the new dispensation, and that the new Jerusalem has already come upon earth, which remarkable fact took place in 1757. Hence, they are called the Church of the New Jerusalem. They have a liturgy, and manifest quite a fondness for ritualism.

The sect of Spiritualists commenced in the United States in 1848, and are said now to number more than a million. Their principal article of belief is that of communion, more or less perfect, with spirits, good or bad. So far as we know, they have very few doctrines, but are advocates of a kind of theism. They can hardly be called a Christian sect, though we must allow every man to call himself by what name he chooses. Many of them sympathize strongly with the Swedenborgians, though they have not the same notions of the New Jerusalem.

The Quakers, or Friends, can hardly be classed

under any particular form of government. They owe their origin to George Fox, their founder, who was born in 1624, and by his preaching and life sought to spiritualize the religions around him. Great earnestness and ability must be attributed to him; and he suffered much persecution for his tenets. The sect received an organization about the middle of the seventeenth century. They reject all external rites or sacraments, and hold only to the new birth and the manifestation of God in the individual heart. Their doctrines are wholly of the interior life, but in dress, manners, and even language, they have become the most exterior sect in the world. The original Quakers held the doctrine of the Trinity, and the incarnation and atonement of our Lord. But there have been several divisions in later times, which are not regarded as orthodox. The followers of Elias Hicks, who caused a schism in 1827, do not hold the Trinity, nor the divinity of our Lord. The whole number of the sect of Friends, taken together, is estimated at two hundred thousand; and they are not increasing. From them have come also the eccentric denomination of Shakers, who owe their origin to Ann

Lee, in 1770. Their tenets are said to have some affinity with Spiritualism.

Those Protestants who contend for the government of the Church by means of bishops are called Episcopalians. Without noticing smaller bodies, there are only the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Protestant Episcopal, which is the same in this respect as the Church of England.

The Methodist Episcopal Church began in the United States about the year 1766. There were at first many Wesleyans, and also some members of the English Church, who joined it. The original members were accustomed to join in the services of that Church, until after their organization. The Rev. John Wesley, a presbyter in the Church of England, considering himself authorized to do so by the circumstances, ordained the Rev. Dr. Coke as a bishop, and sent him to the United States. He in turn ordained Rev. Thomas Asbury. Dr. Coke was present at Baltimore, in 1784, at the conference in which the organization was perfected. From that day the Methodist Episcopal Church has gone on increasing, until it numbers more than a million of members. Various vicissitudes

have, however, attended its progress. Resistance to Episcopacy occasioned the separations which we have already mentioned, and latterly there has been a division on the question of slavery. The Methodist Church South withdrew from the original communion in 1845.

The doctrines of this Church are contained in twenty-five articles modelled after those of the Church of England. They assert the mystery of the Holy Trinity and the atonement of our Lord, but protest against the Catholic Church, and deny many of its doctrines. On the subject of divine grace, they deny predestination as held by Calvin, and defend the freedom of the human will. They believe in the government of the Church by bishops, though not as a necessity, nor by any thing more than an ecclesiastical right. They have three orders in the ministry, bishops, elders, and deacons, whom they set apart by prayer and the imposition of hands. The bishop is the ordinary minister of ordination. They have customs and modes of worship peculiar to themselves, and, in spite of their prelatical discipline, assimilate more with Congregationalists than with any other Protestant sect.

The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States are both believers in the government of the Church by bishops, whom they consider as by divine right necessary to the constitution of the Church. In this respect they differ from the Methodists, who only prefer Episcopacy, but do not consider it essential. Episcopalians believe that our Lord originally established three orders in the ministry, bishops, priests, and deacons, and that the external call or appointment to these orders is derived by succession from the apostles. In their view no one but a bishop can ordain, and no one can be a bishop who has not received his ordination from a bishop duly commissioned. The apostolic succession is then necessary to the very existence of the Church, and in this respect they approach the Catholic doctrine. Yet, practically, this doctrine is not adhered to, and there is a great division in their communion, as a very large proportion of their members sympathize entirely with the reformed Churches, and are not willing to consider those out of the pale of Christianity who hold not to Episcopacy. Our present purpose will lead us to consider the exact position of the English Church, and its

daughter, the Protestant Episcopal Church, in our own country.

The Reformation in England was the parent of both these religious communions, and the continental reformers were the fathers of their theology, although the movement was begun and ended by the arm of civil power. While the convulsions of the continent were desolating society, Henry VIII. found it convenient for his own private purposes to abolish the authority of the Roman Pontiff in England. It was not on questions of faith that he quarrelled with the Pope, for he had already written against Luther in a defence of the Seven Sacraments, which gained for him the title of "Defender of the Faith." But he wished to separate from his lawful wife and to marry another woman, to which crime the Holy See could not consent. Holy Scripture declares that a man is bound by the law of his wife as long as she liveth, so that if he be married to another woman during her life he committeth adultery.* But the reformers, who had already broken, in many instances, their vows of celibacy, found no great difficulty

* Romans, vii. 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39.

in allowing Philip of Hesse to live in bigamy (1539), and naturally the king of England found them friends in his quarrel with Rome. He removed, then, the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope to accomplish his ends, but he remained a Catholic in doctrine to his death, and even, as the head of the Church, bound the old faith upon his kingdom by the severest penalties. He was equally tyrannical to the Protestant and to the Catholic dissenters, who denied his supremacy in religious matters. Yet the main point was gained. Several of the universities under the reformed influence had connived at his adulteries, and the power of the Holy See had been effectually weakened in England.

Edward VI. succeeded in 1547, and during his minority, as well as his short reign, the work of reformation was carried on without much opposition. Archbishop Cranmer, who had been skilful enough to be in the friendship of Henry VIII. and to maintain his sympathy with the movement on the continent, now became the master-spirit of the day. He called in the aid of his friends Ridley and Latimer, Martin Bucer, of Strasbourg, and Peter Martyr, of Zurich, and even solicited the advice of Cal-

vin. The attempt to Protestantize the Church of England was carried out by the publication of forty-two articles of religion, containing the condemnation of the old Church, and a confession of moderate Calvinism. A prayer-book was also framed in the vernacular tongue, with the order for divine worship.

The short reign of Queen Mary, daughter of Catharine of Aragon, and a devout Catholic, interrupted the work of the reformers. The old religion was restored, and the Church, freed from its subserviency to the civil power, rejected in convocation the articles of faith prepared by Cranmer, as well as the book of common prayer, which is condemned in no measured terms.

The death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth turned the tide again, and effected the establishment of the Protestant Church of England. This celebrated sovereign, styled the "Virgin Queen" by her admirers, seems to have had no particular faith, and even sought at first the friendship of the Catholic Church. But those who, with the text of Holy Scripture, had considered her mother's marriage as an adultery, were not likely to recognize the illegitimate daughter of their sovereign. She

therefore gave her heart and soul to the reform, re-established the royal supremacy, renewed the publication of the Protestant articles, and gave birth to a new hierarchy, from which descends the so-called apostolical succession of the Episcopalians in this country as well as in England. This important matter deserves here a moment's notice. The High Church party have staked their all on the validity of this claim to union with the old Church, by means of apostolical ordination. All depends upon the validity of the orders of Matthew Parker, made Archbishop of Canterbury, 1559. The statement of Protestant historians is, that Elizabeth issued her mandate to the bishops of Landaff and Ossory, to Hodgkins, suffragan of Bedford, John, suffragan of Thetford, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale, to convene at Lambeth Chapel, and consecrate Dr. Parker. All refused, except Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, who met on Dec. 17, 1559, and ordained Parker, Barlow acting as consecrator. Now, the Catholic Church, from the very first, has never admitted this ordination as a valid one, and has never recognized any of the English Orders. And this has been the case,

not from any prejudice or controversial necessity on her part, for she has never had any difficulty in admitting the orders of those who separated from her where there existed legitimate authority, and there was evidence of the observance of the required forms. She would no more re-ordain than she would re-baptize. And valid orders in the English Church would not at all better its position, since in heresy and schism there can be no real jurisdiction from Christ. The objections to the orders of Archbishop Parker and his successors, are, first, the want of evidence proving a regular consecration; secondly, the use of a form not sufficient to convey the grace of the sacrament; and, lastly, the probable want of the proper intention. There is altogether wanting such proof of the fact as is necessary in a case so truly important, and upon a point so essential. If the consecration of Dr. Parker be admitted to have taken place from the testimony of the Lambeth register, there is no record whatever of Barlow's consecration, and it can only be presumed from his translation from one see to another under Henry VIII., and his sitting in parliament by virtue of his office. The very great irregularity of all

ecclesiastical affairs at that time, under the royal supremacy, renders this presumption insufficient.

The ordinal of Edward VI., alleged to have been used in this case, is a rite as well adapted to confirmation as to ordination, since there is no mention of the Episcopal office, nor any thing to determine the meaning of the prayers used. It begins with the oath acknowledging the king's supremacy, then several questions follow, but nothing is contained in them to mark the true office of a Christian bishop. In the laying on of hands there is not a word expressive of authority, not a sentence to designate the Episcopal character. By every principle of law taught us by tradition and the ancient rites, this form is wholly null and void, and certainly could never be accepted by the Church. The English communion itself has not been satisfied with this ordinal, and it has been changed; while, for the quieting of scruples, parliament passed a singular act, declaring that the ordinations held under it were to be esteemed sufficient and valid. It sounds strangely to read of a civil congress passing an *ex post facto* act like this; yet, where the crown can

give mission, why cannot parliament heal the invalidity of orders?

For a lawful minister, even in a valid form, the intention of doing what the Church proposes to do, or the external action commanded by Christ, is absolutely requisite. The low and Erastian views which prevailed at the time of the Reformation, are quite an important consideration. Under Edward VI. it was declared, by an act of parliament, that "all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, was derived from the king." In 1540, Archbishop Cranmer replied to certain questions proposed to him, and seemed to look upon the whole clerical office as dependent entirely upon the civil magistrate. "A trace of these sentiments," says Bishop Short, "may be found in those of the thirty-nine articles which relate to the Church, among which Articles XIX., XXI., and XXIII. might be subscribed by any one who held opinions purely Erastian. The bishops were made by the king's letters patent, and the intention was, says Heylin, "to weaken, by degrees, the authority of the Episcopal order, by forcing them from their stronghold of divine institution, and making them no other than the king's ministers only,

his ecclesiastical sheriffs, as a man might say, to execute his will and disperse his mandates." These opinions might, certainly, seriously affect the intention of the ordinary minister. If the very idea of a bishop were lost, he could hardly have the intention to do that which the Church does in the sacrament. There would scarcely be any true ordination, for example, among the Presbyterians or Methodists, even if there were among them any who had been duly consecrated; for, so far from wishing to make a bishop, they deny that there is any such office approved by Christ, and look upon the whole Episcopal order as an unlawful assumption.

On any theory of the Church advanced before the Reformation, there can be no doubt that the English Churches, as well as all the reformed bodies, separated themselves from the old Church and denied the old faith. There is no difference between them and the continental reformers—except, perhaps, in degree of Protestantism. They retained more of the Catholic forms, though even these were sufficiently altered. The writings of their leaders and founders contain as bitter invectives against the Roman Church as any of the works of Luther

or Calvin, and their symbols are as decided in the condemnation of the anciently received doctrine. If the Meletians and Donatists were schismatics by the ecclesiastical law, certainly they were. Their doctrine is contained in the prayer-book, and the articles of belief put forth by them and bound upon the consciences of every minister. There are appearances of contradiction between the articles and the prayer-book, because naturally in the latter old forms, with Catholic phraseology, were sometimes retained; but the articles, being distinctly symbolic, are the true exponents of their system of faith. These articles, after accepting the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, begin at once to condemn Catholic doctrines. They assert the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, interpreted by private judgment, for a rule of faith; deny the infallibility and authority of the Church, affirm the theory of justification by faith in what may be called moderate Lutheranism, teach a weakened Calvinism on the subject of predestination, condemn the invocation of saints and the doctrine of Purgatory. On the question of the sacraments, they reject five of the seven; teach regeneration in baptism very

doubtfully, if at all, and deny any real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, asserting that the mean whereby our Lord is received is faith, while they call the Sacrifice of the Mass, as taught in the Catholic Church, "a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit." There is no Protestant Confession, of which we have any knowledge, which is more vehement in its opposition to the Catholic faith, or more positive in its assertions of the principles of the Reformation.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is a legitimate descendant of the Church of England. The colonies, originally belonging to Great Britain, naturally attracted the members of the national establishment. There was, however, at the time of the American Revolution, much feeling against Episcopacy, on account of the oppressions of the Puritans and the opposition to the mother country. Very many, also, of the members of the English Church were naturally opposed to the movement for independence on the part of the colonies. After the Revolution there was an estrangement between the Episcopalians of this country and their ecclesiastical mother, and

it was with some difficulty that the English prelates were induced to consecrate bishops for the separated States. This happened somewhat through the defect of any parliamentary license. The Episcopalians of Connecticut became tired of waiting for the slow action of the court, and sent the Rev. Dr. Seabury to Scotland, who obtained consecration of the bishops there, November 14, 1784. The General Convention, however, succeeded, in 1785, in sending two presbyters to England, who received their orders in Lambeth Chapel, and became the heads of the American Episcopal Succession. The Convention, in 1789, drew up the constitution of the Church, and set forth the prayer-book, with such alterations as suited the circumstances. In matters of doctrine they reaffirmed the thirty-nine articles, and agree, therefore, with the Church of England substantially, although they have made some progress in the way of the reform. The Athanasian creed, containing the firm declaration of the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, has been dropped. The form of absolution contained in the office for the visitation of the sick was omitted, thereby implying a disbelief in the power of

the priesthood to forgive sin. The same disbelief of the power of absolution appears in the ordination of priests, where a new form is permitted to be used, in place of the old one taken from the Scripture,—"whose sins thou shalt remit, they are remitted."

The Protestant Episcopal Church has increased rapidly since its first settlement, and, by the statements of its own members, numbers nearly two million.

In speaking of the orders of the Church of England, we have already sufficiently spoken of the ecclesiastical position of the Episcopalians. They have never been considered as in any way connected with the Catholic Church, from which they, in common with the other Protestant bodies, have revolted. Whatever is to be charged to the Mother Church is, *a fortiori*, to be laid to the account of the daughter. They are both wholly Protestant bodies, entirely in sympathy with the Churches of the Reformation, and entirely estranged from the old faith and the old traditions.

We do not deny that there are individuals within these communions who make loud pretensions as to love of Catholic doctrine, and

disgust for Protestantism. But the question is not as to individuals, but as to the sentiment of the Church to which they belong. All the pretension in the world will not do away with one single fact, which no one can deny. The thirty-nine articles are as hostile to the Catholic faith as any symbol of the Reformation, and much more so than the original Confession on which Protestants made their separation. These articles are bound upon the conscience of all its members, if their Church has power to bind, and if it has not such power, they at least exhibit the doctrine which prevails. Various movements in the English Church have demonstrated the truth of our remarks. There is the quickest consciousness, and the liveliest aversion is excited the moment a move is made towards the Council of Trent, or any one attempts to Romanize the Liturgy; while the whole Church may drift in the direction of Calvinism or Lutheranism, and no one shows the least surprise. The result of every doctrinal convulsion has been to show most plainly how thoroughly Protestant the heart of Episcopalianism is, and how entirely out of place are its assumptions of Catholic ritualism or practice. Much more

consistent is the ultra-Protestant, who at least calls things by their right names, and eschews both Prelacy and Catholicity. What has been the result of the Oxford movement, as it has commonly been called? For individuals it has certainly brought out much curious imitation of ancient customs; the hearing of confessions, the use of incense and candles, with large innovations in the way of vestments. But from the Church, speaking with all the authority it has, it has caused new and new condemnations of Catholic doctrines, and reprobation of even the higher Church opinions. Is it of no consequence to the members, who profess to see Christ and find communion with Him through the Church to which they belong, that it has reproved them, and knocked from under them the ground on which they stand? Yet we see most respectable and even learned men calling for union with the Apostolic See, and professing to hold doctrines which the Church of England has distinctly reprobated, and in spite of all remaining in her communion. Witness an Eirenicon, lately put forth, which is the boldest caricature of the sentiments of the Establishment, and which pretends to represent

the faith of the Anglican communion. We confess we cannot understand such a state of mind. Either the Church of England has for its members authority, or not. If it has, how can they teach opinions which it has condemned? If it has not, on what authority do they advance and maintain their religious creed? This is, certainly, a strange inconsistency for those who adopt High Church views, and profess obedience to an ecclesiastical teacher.

Having thus considered as briefly as possible the sects which represent Protestantism, their origin and doctrinal position, we are prepared better to examine their claims. And here their claims are so few, and the points they make are of so negative a character, that we shall better explain ourselves by stating what they do not claim.

1. They make no claim whatever to exclusiveness; or when they believe themselves in the right, they do not at the same time assert that others are in the wrong. We do not know of one Protestant Church which consistently believes that it is necessary to salvation to accept its faith, or to belong to its communion. Many think there is no visible Church, and that all

the good of every creed belongs to the invisible body, who, known to God, are to be saved. Others give salvation only to those who, by an arbitrary decree, are elected to such a high privilege. To these the question of Church membership is an idle one, and even doctrines are of no account. The Baptists seem to believe that immersion is necessary to salvation, but as far as we have been able to learn, they do not condemn to eternal punishment all who are not so baptized. There are some Episcopalians who seem to teach that it is necessary to belong to the Catholic Church in some way, meaning by this term their own communion, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Eastern Churches. Yet there are very few who consistently act upon this belief; and these are individuals actually estranged from their own Church, and in no way the exponents of her opinions. We may, therefore, set it down as an admitted fact that no Protestant body claims to represent Christ exclusively, or considers itself necessary to the salvation of mankind. The very grave objection of exclusiveness is constantly urged against the Catholics, and this is a sufficient evidence that such a claim is con-

sidered reprehensible in any one. What we condemn in others, we do not wish to be charged to ourselves. By the very essential principle of Protestantism, every one is free to form his own religious opinions and to worship God according to his own conscience, and with this principle, as we have already seen, every species of Church authority is inconsistent.

2. There is no claim to antiquity. No such claim is even urged, with one or two exceptions, by any Protestant body. In our brief review we have seen the origin of all the reformed Churches, and have noted the day and hour of their birth. Not one of them can honestly go back further than the time of the Reformation, and many have appeared upon the stage at a far more recent period. It is not to the purpose to refer to individuals, or to separations from the Church which took place in earlier days, because, if in some things there be similarity between these sects and the Protestants, there certainly was no continuity of life. If such a claim were to constitute antiquity, they might go beyond the Christian era, and find their counterpart in the divisions of the Jewish Church. The Baptists say that immer-

sion was practised in the early days of Christianity. We admit this, and assert, what no one can deny, that affusion was also practised. Immersion is still practised in the Catholic Church, but not as essential to the validity of baptism. Some writers of the Church of England lay claim to antiquity, and pretend that their communion is descended from the first disciples of St. Paul, who is supposed to have preached the Gospel in their country. But we leave it to any one, not prejudiced, to judge if there be any continuity of life between the Church in England before the Reformation and the Church which has existed there since the days of Elizabeth. If any one else can see it, we cannot. From the days of Augustine to Henry VIII. we see, plainly enough, the continuity of one Church; but, after the convulsions of the sixteenth century, and the reconstruction of the hierarchy by Elizabeth, we cannot see any such continuity, any more than we can see similarity between white and black. For every thing has been changed in internal doctrine as well as in exterior ritual.

And, indeed, on the Protestant theory, of what possible advantage is the claim to antiqui-

ty? An opinion is no better for being older. It is only good for its intrinsic merits, and as far as it is accepted by individual minds. In the system of private judgment a doctrine has no additional weight by reason of its age, and the advantage of all historical testimony is abandoned. Protestantism has, by its very nature, cut loose from all ecclesiastical traditions, and stands alone on its own merits or demerits.

3. All, then, that is or can be claimed, by the different representatives of Protestantism, is that each one thinks the system he has adopted the true one, or, at least, nearest the truth. Yet, as he adopts it on the strength of his own judgment, and is open to correction by any argument satisfactory to his reason, he can lay no claim to being exclusively right, and must yield to his neighbors the same privilege which he demands for himself. In strict logic, then, there is no claim presented, and the only answer to the question, "What is truth?" is "Judge for yourself." If each sect, taken by itself, has no authority to decide controversies of faith, all the sects taken together can have none. No one can give that which he has not himself.

No truth can then be set forth as the authorized teachings of Protestantism, and no agreement in any particular set of doctrines can be established, for no such agreement can be found. There is not one doctrine which is held in common by all the reformed sects, and the distinction between orthodox and unorthodox Protestants, sometimes made, is inconsistent with the very ground-principles of the whole system. No one, in argument, can be allowed to overthrow the foundation on which he himself stands, nor to make a claim suicidal to his own system of belief. Therefore, by the religious systems we have examined there is no such thing as fixed revealed truth, no definite way of salvation proposed to men.

The conclusion to which we come is, then, quite manifest. On the definition of Christianity made in our first lecture, the theory and practice of Protestants are untenable. If our blessed Lord is the founder of Christianity, and if He has revealed certain truths which are necessary to be believed, Protestantism is found wanting.

1. On such a supposition history must be in

good measure our guide, and the old rule, "Let there be no innovation, let the doctrine anciently received be the standard of faith," is one which commends itself to the reason. Christ must have been bound to maintain and keep alive among His followers the true doctrine, at least in substance. When, therefore, we behold a continuity of testimony to certain doctrines, and behold a break in the line of living tradition only at a certain epoch, we conclude that at that epoch a new system was brought in, and have a right to ask for the authority on which new doctrines were introduced. Our divine Lord established the authority of His dispensation, by His own miracles and those of His apostles. If He had not done so, He could not have asked us to believe Him. When, then, the leaders of a great religious movement ask us to accept an acknowledged innovation upon doctrines before universally received, and thus bring in a new dispensation, may we not ask for the same high confirmation, for the proof of miracles which will show that God is with them? No doctrines have been held more firmly and universally than the very ones on which turned the whole controversy of the

Reformation. This may be seen especially in the mystery of the Holy Eucharist, and in the Catholic teaching concerning Purgatory and the Invocation of the Saints.* But not only is there no pretence of miracles, but the very belief in them is attacked. The leaders in the reform cast aside the restraints under which they had lived, and, to say the least, taught a lower system of morality than that in which they had been trained. We look in vain for the evidences of divine interposition, either in the exterior signs of miracles, or in the interior manifestations of sanctity and self-denying virtue. Nearly all of them were vowed to celibacy, and almost all freed themselves from that obligation and lived like other men. Yet, will any one deny that celibacy, when conscientiously practised for the love of our Lord, is a higher life than that of marriage, and one more self-denying? The disciples of the Reformation, to their honor be it said, do not accept, practically, the full consequences of their own system of morality, which excludes the principle of asceticism, and cuts out of religion all that is mortifying to human passion. And the

* See Note A.

sight of Calvary, with its tortures, is enough to put in contrast with their generally received condemnation of austerities. If a St. John the Baptist were to reappear upon earth, would he find a congenial home in such company? No! We have to admit that there is such a decided opposition between Christianity, as the world always knew it before the Reformation, and Christianity as represented by Protestants, that they are really two different religions.

2. Where, then, is the title of any of the Protestant Churches to represent Christ upon earth, or to teach His religion? They cannot agree, and admit no authority to teach even if they could. Unity is necessary by the demonstrations of reason and Scripture, even by the testimony of history. Not only is unity impossible under their theory, but continually widening divisions are a necessity, against which not even one consistent argument can be brought. From the point of pure reason every one must decide which of the many sects he will follow, or whether he will follow none; and the saddest consequence is that very many now in the exercise of their private judgment, reject Christianity altogether, as a complication of contradictions,

and even go so far as to deny the Divine Founder, who is the only Saviour of our humanity, the only light of our reason in the way that leads to eternal peace. Ah! who shall answer for the many gifted souls who have gone down to eternal darkness because they have rejected Him, like the noble vessels stranded on the waves of the ocean, and buried in its unfathomable depths? Who shall give account, in the dread day of judgment, for the loss of that faith which is man's best and happiest treasure in his journey to the grave? Call upon the army of teachers and guides who have brought us new religions, and they answer not in the darkness in which their bewildered children are wandering. No one shall rise from the dead. We have Moses and the prophets; if we will not hear them, neither will we believe if one should come back to us from the world unseen.

LECTURE FOURTH.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

"The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth."—1 E. S. TIMOTHY, iii. 15.

THE one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church claims the authority to represent Christ upon earth, to be the one body to which His promises are made, the one teacher of truth to mankind. Thus she answers to the necessities which we have discovered from reason and Holy Scripture, and is the only solution of the problem which agitates all inquiring minds in our day. We shall in this discourse briefly consider her claims, the arguments on which she substantiates them, and reply to some of the objections which are raised against her. Then we shall be prepared to draw the conclusions which flow from our short course of lectures.

I.

1. The Catholic Church needs no definition. It is that body which, in union with the Bishop

of Rome as its visible head on earth, spreads throughout the world, and everywhere presents the features of a rigid unity, both in doctrine and discipline. She is easily known by her external characteristics, and by the oneness of her faith. Existing in many lands, she nevertheless binds together all tribes and tongues in the belief of one religion. In the lands of the ice-bound poles, in the sunny South, in the far and ancient East, and in the active and growing West, she is still the same. Gathering the unlettered around her, and preaching the gospel to the poor, she, at the same time, leads the devotees of science and art into the inner sanctuary of her beauties, and elevates the pure and holy to the noblest morality. The world has never seen a unity like hers, nor witnessed the triumphant life of an organization like hers, against which powers and principalities have been arrayed. She, thus known, and thus easily recognized, claims for herself exclusively a divine mission, asserting that she, and she alone, is sent with the power of her Divine Head and Redeemer to make known His truth, and preach His saving doctrines among all nations. She claims that the Almighty Lord incarnate formed

her, breathed into her His life, and sent her upon her errand of mercy. Composed, indeed, of frail and fallible men, she professes to be upheld by an unearthly power, and that now the revelation of God is mediate to the world through her. She is kept from error by the Holy Spirit, and through her authorized ministers teaches what men must believe if they will be saved. All her powers proceed from Christ. The priesthood, in its various ranks, was commissioned by Him, and comes in an unbroken line from Him. The sacraments are channels of grace, only because He has made them such, and is ever faithful to His word. And no one can share with her in this high mission, because Christ, who, as God, is the author of peace and not of contradiction, has not established two, nor many churches, any more than He took many bodies in the gracious work of His incarnation. Whatever, then, men are to know of revealed truth, whatever light to gain in the way of their supernatural destiny, they must receive it from and through her.

2. In order to accomplish this, her office to men, she maintains the most rigid unity, which she believes to be necessary for her work. To

teach, she must have but one voice, easily heard, and speaking in no uncertain accents. Visible unity and corporate life, by which she is distinguishable from all other bodies, are, therefore, a necessity. And oneness of doctrine is also the consequence of her high powers. If she could teach different or opposing doctrines her authority would cease, since "a house divided against itself cannot stand." No way can be conceived of, by which she could discharge her mission if she were not absolutely one. She has, then, one visible head, the successor of St. Peter, who was appointed by Christ to rule and feed His whole flock, one external organization which can never be broken, but must remain unimpaired to the end of time. Individual members may fall away, as branches from a tree, but the unity of the parent trunk remains untouched. No external pressure, nor internal strife can rend the body of Christ, nor tear in pieces His seamless garment. Those who remain in communion with this Church and its head, are in union with Christ. Those who fall away and separate themselves, are cut off from that union. Man had nothing to do with the forming of the Church, any more than

with making the plan of salvation. God Himself, who is essentially One, is the source of this unity; and He who never can know change, nor shadow of turning, keeps alive in a human organization this admirable oneness. She bears the comparisons instituted in Holy Scripture. As a house standing upon one foundation, as the human body with its one seat of intelligence and will, so is she one, presenting to the world an instance, without parallel, of a unity which neither the convulsions of time nor the frailty of man has been able to impair. She is one, having many members, from the humblest of her little children to the highest of her hierarchy, yet all are in their appropriate place, have their own office, and share her honor.

3. Consistently, also, infallibility is another of her claims, for her principal office is that of teaching, and in this office, as God teaches through her, she cannot err. This must be so, or she cannot teach; for he who teaches doubtfully or erroneously, is worse than no teacher at all. What greater enemy of truth can there be than he who preaches falsehood, and under the semblance of the right leads to error? There is nothing mysterious in this, certainly nothing

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

difficult of comprehension. Almighty God has all along spoken by prophets, and under the Old Law He spake by the Jewish Church. His revelation has never been immediate to all men. All that can be asked is, that evidence be given us that it is God who speaks, and that the instrumentality which He uses is infallible. It is as easy for God to speak through a Church which spreads throughout the world, as to proclaim His truth by prophets, who cannot reach all mankind. This infallibility does not imply that individual members of the Church may not err, much less that they will not sin; but that the teaching of the Church in faith or morals is certain. There have been many who have misunderstood our notion of infallibility. But, rightly comprehended, there is nothing in it that is not strictly in accordance with reason. A revelation from God to man is even conjectured by reason, and certainly is not repugnant to our natural ideas of the relations between the Creator and the creature. But a revelation, if made at all, must contain certain important truths, which man needs to know as much in one age as in another, and which must, therefore, be kept alive on earth by means of an un-

failing instrumentality. There must be no uncertain voice which shall teach men these truths, otherwise men will never know what God reveals; for to be doubtful is no better than to be ignorant. And there is no repugnance in preserving truth by means of an association miraculously sustained. It was done under the Jewish law, and our Lord promised to do the same, and even more, for the Church He was to establish. "I will send you the Paraclete, who shall abide with you, and shall guide you into all truth." "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." "The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church." It can scarcely be denied that the Church of Christ must teach His doctrine, and that the moment it teaches falsehood, it ceases to be His Church. The true Church must, then, of necessity, be infallible. If there be no body professing any such claim, then there is no Church of Christ upon earth. And if there be no such Church, where shall man learn His doctrine? Under such a supposition, the system of Moses will have had greater characteristics of divinity than that of Christ, and mankind were really nearer the knowledge of

the truth under the Old Law, than they can be now under the dispensation of Grace.

4. With such claims of authority the Catholic Church insists on her indefectibility of life, and that no power of evil can destroy her. She must subsist to the end, overcoming every tendency to dissolution from without and from within. This must necessarily be the case, since her mission is for all time and for all generations of men. She is as much needed now as ever before, and will be as much required by the last age as she was for the first. The reason of her existence continuing, she must continue. All merely human organizations, in process of time, decay and fall by their own weight. But an organization formed by Christ, and sent by Him into the world for the purpose of teaching His religion, must be of necessity endowed with life which shall rise above the changes and chances of time. Here, again, there is no repugnance which reason can discover, no impossibility in the nature of things, and no incongruity with the divine plans. It is certainly in the power of God to keep alive a society which He Himself has established, for there is no contradiction involved in it, and contradic-

tion is the only repugnance that could possibly be discovered. On the contrary, there would appear an inconsistency if the divine power should form a Church and then allow it to die, unless it were to be replaced by a newer and better system. And this would require another interposition from Heaven, as great and wonderful as was the coming of Christ. Reason indicates to us that there can be no greater interposition than that which brought down God's only Son to take our nature, while Holy Scripture declares that there can be no other. "This is the last time." "There is no other Name given under Heaven whereby man can be saved, save only the Name of Jesus Christ," "before whom the whole creation shall bow down, things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth."

When, then, the Catholic Church claims to be indefectible, she only reasserts her title to be the Church of Christ and her claim to a divine mission. From the past she gives a sufficient guarantee of the future. She has survived the shock of centuries, the power of persecution in every ingenious device of diabolical malice, the convulsions of tribes and nations. In this she

gives good assurance that she will outlive every storm and be found in her lot when her divine Founder shall come again.

And here we may add that the division of this Church into many parts would have been the same thing as its destruction. Either, in case of a division, there would be several parts, all having equal authority, or only one of the parts would have authority. On the former supposition the Church ceases to exist, for differing factions mutually destroy each other, and mankind could never know which was the true Church. They could not all be true, because they do not agree, and difference of doctrine was the cause of separation. On the second supposition there really was no division, but only a secession of certain parties from the one true Church, which still retains its authority. Indefectibility, then, implies unity.

II.

But the world has a right to ask her for the proofs upon which she substantiates her high claims. She must give good and satisfactory

reasons for the authority she assumes, and bring credentials which no one can safely disregard. Here we can make no pretension to exhaust the subject, but shall only do what time and space allow—present a few arguments whose force, it seems to us, no reasonable mind can resist.

1. It is not necessary for us to repeat what we have already demonstrated. We have shown in our first lecture, which has been well corroborated by succeeding discourses, that one Church is necessary to the existence of Christianity. Now, there is no Church on earth which is one, or claims to be one, which has ever united men, or can ever do so, except the Catholic Church. Men must then go to her, or, by our arguments, the whole fabric of Christianity will fall, and in division and uncertainty the faith will be lost. Men may know many things, but they will not know that body of doctrine which Christ taught, and which has therefore a right to bear His name.

2. The Church proves her authority by appeal to simple facts, abundantly attested and generally established by history. Eighteen centuries ago there appeared upon earth One

who claimed to be God as well as man, the Messiah so long predicted by prophets, who, by the truth of their prophecies, had proved their inspiration. His life is a matter of common history. His claims to divinity were substantiated by miracles seen and admitted by many and reliable witnesses. He healed the sick and raised the dead. He could not have done this if He had been an impostor, for God only can work genuine miracles, and God cannot connive at a lie, much less at any assumption of His own prerogatives. The Jews, who hated Him, confessed His miracles, and even sought His interposition in their distresses. At last, put to an ignominious death by their malice, He raised Himself from the grave on the third day, as He had promised, and appeared to witnesses so numerous and so unimpeachable that the evidence of His resurrection can in no way be doubted without destroying the credibility of all human testimony, and so opening the way to universal skepticism. Our Lord Jesus Christ thus proved Himself to be God according to His own words, "I and the Father are one." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." It is a fact that He, before He left the world, organized a

Church, for the government of which He made provision, and which he declared should continue until the end of time. We here quote the Scriptures as an authentic history, containing a true statement of facts, without in any way relying upon their inspiration. They establish the existence of the Church, its unity, its infallibility and indefectibility, as all contained in His promise.

"And when day was come, He called unto Him His disciples, and He chose twelve of them, whom also He named apostles."*

"Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."†

"And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."‡

"And the glory which thou hast given to Me, I have given to them, that they may be one, as We also are one."§

"When the Spirit of Truth is come, He will teach you all truth."‖

"You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen

* S. Luke, vi. 13. † S. John, xx. 23. ‡ S. Matt. xvi. 18.
§ S. John, xvii. 22. ‖ Ib. xvi. 13.

you, that you should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain." *

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."†

God cannot fail in His promises, and these words of Jesus Christ, who proved Himself to be divine, must have their fulfilment. Yet where is there any such fulfilment if it be not in the Catholic Church? There is no other Church which dates her origin from Him. No other body descends from Him by a sure and unquestionable succession. We have even seen how recent is the birth of all the Protestant Churches. If, then, the Catholic Church be not the Church of Christ, there is none upon earth. But the word of God cannot fail, therefore the Catholic Church is the one Church to which these promises were made.

Yet again, there is no other religious body on

* S. John, xv. 16. † S. Matt. xxviii. 18–20.

earth which even lays claim to the gifts our Lord promised, to divine mission, to infallibility, to indefectibility. Some body must possess these powers, or Christ's words are not true. Who, then, has these powers; the body which has always claimed them, or one which never asserted them, and even denies that it has them? These powers cannot belong to all the Protestant sects, because their doctrines are discordant, and if they belong to any one of them, the Church of fourteen centuries never possessed them, since the teaching is new and in opposition to that which the world had taken for the religion of Christ. By such a supposition the promises of our Lord failed for fourteen hundred years, and were suddenly fulfilled in an inextricable confusion, of which mankind can gather nothing. We must then give to the Catholic Church the claims she makes to infallibility, or this gift is nowhere to be found, and doubt is thrown upon the divinity of the Founder of Christianity. Yea, more; as reason establishes His divinity in the complete testimony we have received, doubt is thrown upon all human testimony, and man can believe nothing which he does not see with his own eyes, and

becomes thoroughly skeptical, without faith either human or divine.

3. The existence of the Church is itself a fact which no one can deny, and her life at the present day, after all she has endured, is an evidence that God is with her. Find us a human society which has lived the fourth part of her long and wonderful life. Show us an empire, however closely consolidated by the hand of power, which has survived during her memorable history, or has outlived any such convulsions as have shaken her. Yet there is no parallel between her and any earthly kingdom, for she has lived against and not upon the civil arm, and she has not gratified, but rather resisted the passions of men. She has flourished in spite of persecution, fire and sword, imprisonment and death. She has taught the denial of the appetites, the subjection of pride, the realities of the world to come, in opposition to the seductions of this present scene. She has had attacks from enemies without, and more grievous blows from faithless children within. Yet she stands undismayed when the world is arrayed against her, and suffers patiently after the example of her Master on His cross.

Christian society cannot ignore her, for she formed and sustains it. Statesmen cannot overlook her, for her footprints are everywhere; her teachings are the foundation of ethics, her principles the preservation of law. Historians find her ever-pervading influence binding together the threads of their science, and reading to them the lessons of its philosophy.

Now, in face of this great fact, does not reason acknowledge that there is something more than human in her, a power which rises above the forces of nature, a life which can only find its explanation in the divine interposition?

Why is it that kingdoms and sovereigns, and even her adversaries, are forced to acknowledge her might, and fear her if they do not love her? Why is she the central point of attack towards which converge the arrows which fly from every errorist? Why is her name on every one's lips, a power universally acknowledged, if not revered? We may theorize, and struggle with visionaries, but we cannot argue against facts. These are as the luminaries which God has placed in the heavens to give light by day and night. No one can close his eyes to the beams which they shed on the face of universal nature.

III.

We proceed now briefly to notice certain objections which are often made to the claims of the Catholic Church. They do in no way overthrow the arguments we have advanced, and yet they afford difficulty to some minds who are in search for truth.

1. The divisions of Christians, even before the period of the Reformation, are alleged as an argument against the authority of the Church. It is also said that Catholics themselves are not agreed upon all points, that there have been many disputes and dissensions, and that our boasted unity is, after all, not real.

We reply that, considering the frailty of men, it could not have been expected that all the members of the Church should persevere in obedience and unity. It was distinctly foretold by the apostles that there should arise false teachers who should attack the doctrine delivered by Christ, and go away from the Church, leading disciples after them. This in no way disturbs the unity of the original body from which they secede. It is only necessary that

the lines of truth be clear, and that there be a manifest distinction between the true faith and heresy. Rather, the secessions and errors of misguided men make evident the truth, and bring out in light the full proportions of the old doctrine. As a virtue gains strength by struggle with its opposing vice, so truth becomes more and more known by its combat with error. Before the Reformation the unity of the Church was a doctrine held by all Christians, and they who departed from her fold were considered to have fallen away from Christ.

And as for the assertion that Catholics do not agree, it is founded upon a misunderstanding. We have just as much liberty in all matters of opinion as any one could desire. Whatever is not of faith, and we certainly know all that is such, is open to the discussion of theologians and philosophers. Each one may have his opinion, which is always held in due subservience to the authority of the Church. There are a thousand questions which the supreme authority has never decided, and probably never will settle. In all these questions there is perfect freedom. All that can be asked of the Church is that her members unite in the con-

fession of one faith, and in practical obedience to what she declares that God has revealed. And here the world admits the wonderful unanimity of the Catholic Church, and even charges it against us, calling us exclusive, and saying that we make no progress with the age, that we bind down our people to an iron and unyielding yoke. We accept the reputation thus given to us, only answering that this yoke of Christ is perfect freedom, that the greatest gift a man can have is certainty in faith, and that doubt is far from being a privilege.

2. We are told, again, that many of our people are unholy; that they are unlike Christ in their lives; and that corruption has invaded every rank of our members, from the pontiff and priest to the lowest peasant.

This objection amounts to nothing, however, unless it be shown that such impurity of life is the direct effect of our doctrines, and that we teach men to be wicked. This will be hardly pretended when it is known that we lay great stress upon good works as the condition of salvation; that all our sins are to be accounted for, and that confession even will not profit us without repentance and amendment of life. In

all religious bodies wicked men are found, and even the net of St. Peter contained good and bad fishes. Even the tares grow up with the wheat, and will not be separated until the great harvest. But we can safely point to those who follow our teachings as the exponents of our religion, to examples of self-denial, purity, and high courage, such as have never been found out of our communion. Behold a priesthood, which girdles the earth, separated from human ties, living, laboring and dying in the spirit of sacrifice. Behold an innumerable train of virgin souls who, for the love of Christ, have renounced the world and aspire only for the chaste embrace of their heavenly Spouse. You may call this by any name you choose, but it is not slavery to passion, it is not the religion of the world, nor the ambition of the votaries of pleasure. It is something above the natural or carnal life, and it could not be sustained without high hopes of heaven and a strong faith in the world unseen. It is not an idle thing, if eternity be worth more than time, if the golden wreaths of the just are more precious than the laurels of earth. The pure and true must admire whatever rises above passion, whatever

emancipates man from the thraldom of his animal nature, whatever elevates him in the scale of creation towards the supreme Good, his great Creator. And that is holiest and best which most nearly approaches the example of Jesus Christ.

3. Another objection, very often raised against the Catholic faith, is that it is difficult of apprehension, and even sometimes opposed to reason. To this we reply that it is not possible to remove all difficulty from truths which concern the infinite God and His relations to man. The creature can never fully comprehend the Creator, and hence, in any true religion, there must be mysteries, or doctrines, whose whole proportions are not manifest to the human mind. If it were otherwise, God would only be the equal of His creatures, and any system of belief which proposes to level all to the dimensions of our finite understandings is, by this very feature, proved to be false. Mysteries cannot be done away with. The being of God is a mystery, and yet is the primary and fundamental truth. We cannot even explain our own existence, nor tell how the fruits of the earth grow, nor how the flowers of the field put

on their bright colors. God cannot speak to man and not make evident the distance between the finite and the infinite. All that can be asked is a clear revelation, with abundant evidence that God is speaking, and that there can be no deception. When such evidence is given, it really matters not what the truth revealed may be, since there is no difficulty in believing any thing on the divine authority. God cannot be deceived, nor can He deceive; whereas, *we* know very little and are far from being certain in our reasonings. No one can doubt the omniscience or veracity of God without being an atheist altogether. Neither can any one say that God cannot reveal what truths He pleases to man, without at the same time denying His omnipotence and thereby His existence. We ask the evidence of miracles to substantiate a divine revelation, and when these are proved to have occurred there can be no further question. All the truths taught by the Catholic Church rest upon the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose divinity was abundantly established. He taught us all we know, and He keeps alive our faith according to His promise. Besides, He has continually shown

His approbation of the faith of His Church by miracles, which, though not so frequent as at the beginning of the new dispensation, occur from time to time where there is need of such interposition.

The difficulty of apprehension is not peculiar to the truths taught by the Church. There are many Protestants who accept part of our doctrine, and receive truths full as hard to be understood as any we propose. The Trinity of Persons in God is a mystery far beyond our capabilities to fathom, and presents as difficult points for the reason as any portion of our creed. The divinity of Jesus Christ is so fundamental to Christianity, that there is no such thing as Christianity if it be rejected. Our Lord cannot otherwise be held even to have been a good man, because, by the supposition, He professed to be that which he was not. There can be no greater impiety than for a mere man to call himself God. Yet of all truths proposed to our faith there is none more difficult of comprehension than that God should have become man. Instead, therefore, of laying this difficulty to the charge of the Catholic Church, it is only an argument that she truly teaches a divine reve-

lation, while it is not peculiar to her alone among those who call themselves Christians.

As for the objection that any of our tenets are contrary to reason, it is wholly untrue, and arises from a misconception either of our belief or of the powers of human reason. In the first place, the truths proposed being above reason, cannot be contrary to it, for there are no means of judging within our power. For example, who can say that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is unreasonable? It is not, indeed, in accordance with reason that there should be three human persons in one being, yet who can say that it is not perfectly reasonable, nay, even necessary, that there should be three Divine Persons in one God? The mystery of the Holy Eucharist is not according to human laws, yet is perfectly consonant with the Divine attributes. If we were to hold that two substances were co-existing in the same space, we might advance a contradiction, and seem to assert a thing to be and not be at the same moment. But we do nothing of this kind when we say that the Body of Christ takes the place of the substance of bread and wine, and only assumes its external forms. Every thing but contradic-

tion (and that is nothing) is within the power of God, and where is the difficulty of believing that He is omnipotent? If we will have no faith but that which reason teaches, we shall never rise above our own order and can never accept any revelation. It is, then, an argument in favor of the Catholic Church that she proposes high and mysterious truths, provided that she gives us evidence that God speaks through her. In no other way could she consistently pretend to be a messenger from God, or to have any thing more than mere natural powers.

4. The opposition of the world, instead of being an argument against the Church, is an unmistakable proof of the divinity of our claims. If the Church be from God, she must of necessity teach a high and holy doctrine, above the passions and natural impulses of the human heart. She, therefore, comes into collision with the votaries of the world, and sets her face against its seductive pleasures. Moreover, our Lord Himself gives it as a sign of His Church that she should be everywhere spoken against. "You shall be hated by all men for My name's sake. When they shall persecute you in one city, flee into another. The disciple is not above his master,

nor the servant above his Lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!"* When, then, the world combines with every errorist to call the Church by harsh and censorious names, when men ascribe her really mighty works and undying energy to the devil, when they even call her "Babylon, the mother of abominations," and talk of her as "the man of sin," what do they do but fulfil the predictions of her Founder? They called Him a "wine-bibber," the "friend of publicans and sinners." Is it not strange that all the various sects who mutually destroy each other are banded together in one common hostility to her? Yet in every one of them can be found fragments of Catholic doctrine sufficient to lead the consistent to her communion, since all, taken together and judged by their own confession, give evidence to the whole body of her faith. We admit, then, the opposition of the world, and only refer to it as a proof that while the legacy of our Master descends to us we have a good title to be His children. Certainly there is something remarkable in the attitude of the Catholic Church;

* S. Matthew x. 22–5.

feared by those who profess to despise her, hated by those who neither know her doctrine nor her history, yet a veritable power on earth, and acknowledged to possess a superhuman vitality, astonishing even to her enemies. So once said to us an eminent Protestant, "If she be not of God, she must be of the devil." Her wonderful energy cannot be accounted for on any theory of mere human forces. Often oppressed and seemingly overcome, she yet outlives every persecutor, and the power that oppresses her soon vanishes from the earth. The days of her darkest sufferings have even been changed into scenes of her most glorious triumphs. No nation or kingdom that makes war upon her has ever prospered.

5. We shall only notice for a moment an assertion, sometimes made, which is deemed by many as the finishing stroke to all our claims. It is said that the Catholic Church has corrupted the faith of Christ, and is no longer the legitimate heir to the promises of its Founder. Now, upon whose authority is this said? Who, but an infallible authority, can say that the doctrines she teaches are false? And where is this authority? It is not pretended.

Secondly, she cannot have become corrupt, if she ever was the true Church of Christ, since the gates of hell even are not allowed to prevail against her, and the body of Him "who filleth all in all" cannot see corruption. If that society, which once was Christ's Church, has ceased to be such, then all the promises of the gospel must be esteemed a fiction. And if the Catholic Church be not the true fold, where is there any flock to bear the Christian name?

Thirdly, if the doctrines now taught by us are false, they were always false—just as false in the second or fourth century as now. But the same doctrines have been confessed as well in the ages of St. Cyril and St. Augustine as in this epoch of Pius IX. Hence, there has never been any established and reliable Christianity upon earth. There is not one argument in proof of the corruption of the Catholic Church which does not bear equally as well against every tenet of our religion, and even against the divinity of our divine Founder. As for the more absurd theory, that the Church is to be found in the state of disunion, that the Eastern Churches and the Anglican communion are to be reckoned as parts of one great whole, and

that they are to be taken as an authority when they speak of the errors of the Church of Rome, there never was a more contradictory or baseless assumption. In the first place, the Church, by all we have demonstrated, cannot be divided so that three or four parts, so-called, shall each have mission from God. This cannot be, since division has only been caused by difference of doctrine, and hence one must be right and the others wrong; or else all are wrong and no one to be relied upon. In the latter case the Church has ceased to exist, while in the former there have only been separations from the one body of the faithful.

Secondly, the whole theory is a baseless assumption. The Eastern Churches, commonly called orthodox, are more schismatical than heretical; although, to say the least, they do not receive in words the proper doctrine of the Trinity, while the English Churches are, as we have seen, connected with the Protestant Reformation, and totally estranged from all the traditions of either East or West. No corruption more fatal could be conceived of than such a division of the Church—none more impossible

in the nature of things, and none more inconsistent with the promises of Christ.

IV.

The conclusion, then, to which we come from all the arguments adduced is, that the one, holy, Catholic, and Roman Church, is the one fold which the Good Shepherd has established, and over which He ever faithfully watches. We have shown how unity is necessary to the very existence of Christianity upon earth, how the divisions of Protestantism are suicidal and destructive of all faith, that there is no body besides the Catholic communion which even claims the prerogatives of Christ's Church, and that her credentials are such that every reasonable man is bound to obey her. What more remains but to thank God that He hath made our path so clear, that He hath set the city of truth upon a hill where she cannot be hid? He has promised that the Sion of His Son shall be exalted upon the mountains, and that all nations shall ascend to her. And so shall it be, when, as even now, the good and pure are

coming to her altars, so long unknown, to worship the God of Unity in spirit and truth, when the earnest are daily blessing the Lord of Life for the faith so long misunderstood, the truth they have so long sought, which is the unspeakable rest of their souls.

Well may they say, in words which in these latter days have come from many hearts, O ancient beauty, why have I not known thee before, since thou, in thy wonderful attractions, fillest up every want of my soul, and makest my whole being to rejoice? Why have I not seen thee in the face of universal nature, in the sunlight that paints this footstool of my Creator, in the shadows that pass so majestically over the lights of heaven, in the flowers that smile in brightness, in the fruits that crown the harvest of the Almighty hand, in the animate creation which exults in praise, still more in my own wondrous being, formed by the Triune Mind, and called to endless beatitude? O my mother, how hast thou drawn me to thy nourishing bosom, from the hour when first my reason opened to seek the face of God, or learned to bow down at the dearer name of my incarnate Lord! How have I been famishing,

in strange pastures, for the food thou only hast treasured in thy plenteous stores! O how wonderful art thou, the fulness of my crucified Lord, thou spouse of the Lamb, thou city of holiness, thou home of the soul! Here have I found rest till God shall call me from faith to fruition, from trial and conflict to His all-illuminating presence. When men deride thee, I will cling to thee more closely; when they, through ignorance, speak evil of thee, I will wait in patience till thy truth and virtue shall be made known. If thy garments are soiled with the dust of ages, and no princely crown is on thy brow, yet thou art no worse than thy Master, who tracked His sorrowful way in His own blood, and went, bruised and broken-hearted, to Calvary. Thou bearest the image of thy Lord, suffering only to conquer, dying only to rise again. In thee I behold my only saviour, the emancipator of my darkened intellect, the rest of my wearied heart, the glorifier of my regenerated humanity.

Let us pray God that, in these Advent days, He may be pleased to send light to those who are seeking, and repose to those who have toiled in vain, that the Orient from on high may rise

in the full splendor of His beams upon our beloved country, and bring back the erring to the knowledge of the truth, the wandering to their Father's house, that all in unity may worship the one God, and rejoice in the graces of "One Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism."

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

PART FIRST.

THE POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES.

In our third lecture we noticed, among other Protestant denominations, the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. Inasmuch, however, as these bodies make more pretensions, and are therefore more inconsistent than their fellows, it seems worth while to notice them particularly, lest any one should say that we are ignoring their claims. We shall find, on examination, that they have no reason to be distinguished above the rest of Protestant Christianity, except, perhaps, for their more illogical position. And here it is certainly fair to take the recognized standards of a church as its only authority, for the opinions of individuals are of no weight against such incontestable evidence of doctrine.

There are, no doubt, a few among the Episcopalians who are willing to receive the Tridentine doctrine, either in whole or in part, yet they are really in no sense the exponents of the teaching of their Church. Paper theories and fictitious statements can have no influence with reasoning men for any length of time. Facts confront us all, and every Church, if it speak at all, must speak by means of its articles of faith. Secondly, in discussing any ecclesiastical question, we must follow the rules laid down by the traditions of the past, otherwise we can never understand each other, nor even agree as to the meaning of our terms. On these principles it will be easy to show that the Anglican Churches are Protestant bodies, and that they are, by the ancient ecclesiastical law, both schismatical and heretical. We shall have to ask excuse, in advance, for some repetitions which may be necessary to render, at each step, our meaning clearer.

1. The Church of England is as much the offspring of the Reformation as any other Protestant communion, or any of the continental sects. She has identified herself directly with the whole doctrinal movement of the sixteenth

century, and her confessions of faith are as positive in their Protestantism as they can be made. There would never have been any separation from the Catholic Church but for the adoption of Lutheran or Calvinistic doctrine. The thirty-nine articles are their authorized standard, and certainly no time need be spent in proving their entire sympathy with the Reformation. In England every minister is obliged to subscribe them, and no one can fairly say that they are capable of a Catholic interpretation. The attempt so to explain them away has been made, and has been received with the utter reprobation of the whole Anglican communion.

The Episcopal Church in the United States has called herself Protestant, and thus, in the clearest manner, asserts her claim to the heritage of the reformers. The principle of private judgment, which we have considered in our second lecture, has been completely adopted by both these Churches, as well in theory as in practice. They make, in their sixth article, the Scriptures the rule of faith, as they are interpreted by individual minds, because they deny the infallibility of the Church, and admit

the possibility of its misinterpreting the sacred text. In practice it is freely left to the individual to settle all questions of faith for himself, and there are very few who admit that the Church has any authority to command their belief. Those who are so generous as to give this power in words to their Church cannot really mean what they say, for the Church denies it, and condemns even their statements; and surely the ecclesiastical authority which they respect knows its powers better than they do. With the principle of private judgment there can consistently be no assumption of any prerogatives in matters of belief. With such as agree with the general current of Protestant opinion, there can be no question between us on this point. And with such as pretend to hold Roman doctrine, and say they do not believe the thirty-nine articles, our argument is short. On what authority do they believe the tenets they hold, and on what claim reject the received standards of their own communion? Surely not on the decision of the Catholic Church, for then they would submit in all things to her voice. Not on the declarations of their own spiritual mother, since their

first act is to renounce her teachings. Then do they act on their own private judgment, and are as much Protestants when they interpret tradition as when they explain the Bible. That there has not been a true accord between the members of the Anglican Communion is only another evidence in our favor. It is a proof that they, like all the children of the continental Reformation, are subject to the mutations which accompany every merely human society. Their writers have various theories in regard to the sacraments, and all the most important points of religion. There is great diversity among their clergy, and as much difference between some of their congregations as if they belonged to opposing sects. And to crown all, none of them really pretend that the belief of their doctrines is necessary to salvation.

2. Yet in spite of the universal reception of the principle of private judgment, and the open profession of Protestant doctrines, there are some who tell us that these churches have mission from Christ as a part of the one true Church, which, according to their theory, is now divided. We have sufficiently shown the absurdity of supposing a division of Christ's kingdom into frag-

ments. Yet they tell us that where there exists a ministry validly ordained, that is, commissioned by apostolic succession, there is a Church, no matter how that succession be maintained, or what doctrines are taught. This is, at first sight, an absurdity; for, granting the frailty of men, it is not possible to keep the apostolic succession within the bounds of the true Church alone. Bishops are as likely to err as laymen; and hence, as they have the power to ordain, they can carry mission with them wherever they go, and there may be as many true churches as there are opposing prelates. Then there has been no schism where there have been validly ordained bishops. Then the Donatists were not schismatics. Then the various Eastern sects, which retained the true succession and the ancient rite, were, in spite of their heresy, part and parcel of the one Church. Then all authority in matters of faith ceases. It is not enough for the Anglican Churches to show that they have valid ordination. We have already expressed our opinion upon the validity of their orders, which the Catholic Church has never recognized. Yet this is not the vital point, since we never question the orders of the Nes-

torians, the Monothelites, and many others who are still excluded from Catholic communion, and estranged from Christ. To save themselves from the guilt and consequences of schism, they must show that they have never separated from the Church, that they have never rejected the old faith. How can they show either? In England, the first step was the rejection of the Papal Supremacy, in order to establish the religious authority of the king. Can any one say, with the lights of ecclesiastical history in view, that such a proceeding was regular? Was it ever admitted that the crown could give jurisdiction to the ministry of Christ? The Church of England proper, finds its establishment only in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when, for the first time after years of convulsion, the lines of separation were clearly drawn. Then by whose authority was the new hierarchy appointed, and who gave them mission? They were put in their sees in spite of the protests of the lawful bishops, and in direct violation of the commands of the Holy Roman Church. If the queen could give them any jurisdiction, then they have it. If she could not, then they are schismatics and intruders. We leave this ques-

tion to any fair student of ecclesiastical history. It will not avail to say that the Holy See had no authority in England. This is an assumption of private judgment. By all, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was acknowledged, and the English prelates could not renounce it without putting their own opinion before the decisions of the Church, and setting themselves above the received ecclesiastical system. And certainly bishops without a name, a see, or title, cannot have mission from God, nor impart it on the sole command of a sovereign. Nowhere in the record of schisms has there been so high-handed a departure from principles lying at the foundation of the Church, as in the case now before us. And if it was not a schism in the strict sense of the term, there never has been any, and there never will be any. The only way to justify the whole movement is by the principles of the Reformation, which ignored and scouted at all pretensions of Church authority, and fell back directly upon God and His word, as interpreted by the individual. Far more logical are those Protestants who stand by their colors, and see no distinction between prelacy and papacy, no right for any body

of men to usurp prerogatives which they will concede to no one. We can comprehend their position as denying all Church authority, but we confess we do not understand how one can claim sympathy with the ancient Church, and at the same time renounce the principles essential to its very existence. Unity is one of these first principles, by which each bishop rules his flock in subordination to the visible head of the Church, and through him to Christ. Thus, only, is authority regulated, which becomes lost in division, and, left to individual judgment, ceases to command the respect of men.

3. As we have shown the union with the reform which gave life to the English Church, we have proved its professions of Protestantism, and its consequent heresy, in the received sense of the term. Our argument is very simple, as we are not obliged to repeat the language of our lectures. There is no such thing as heresy among Protestants, for there is no authority higher than each individual. We have only, then, to state that the Church of England has departed from the old faith, and has adopted the new notions of Luther and Calvin. No one can deny the latter, and so every one must ad-

mit the former statement. Taking historical Christianity as our guide, we see at once how this Church differs from what the world has always known as the Bride of Christ. Its first formers were so sensible of this fact, that they justified themselves by the expression of their conviction that the whole Church had become corrupt, and hence was no longer worthy of confidence.

It may be asserted, that one of the prime articles of faith was the belief in "One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." The Anglican communion can receive this in no intelligible sense, for they have broken unity, and do not believe in its necessity. They can only substantiate their position by calling themselves a part of the Church, thus teaching the contradiction, of a division of unity. A Church divided, is certainly not *one*. Then they have rejected in express words the infallibility of the Church, asserting that all the Christian world has erred, and thus leaving man without any sure guide. Neither is there any profession of faith in the Church as a necessity in the divine plans, nor any condemnation of those who do not belong to her communion. In Article XIX.

is given a definition of the Church, which leaves open every important question in controversy. "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things which of necessity are requisite to the same." Here we find words, and no sense. Who are faithful men? What is the pure word of God? What are the sacraments, and what are the things necessary to their administration? These are the great inquiries to which no reply is made. One does not know if any Church be requisite to salvation. Such, certainly, was never the uncertain language of early days; of S. Cyprian, already quoted; of any of the doctors of the Catholic Church.

No schismatical body can profess the unity of the Church, since its very existence is an open breach of it. The Church of England, therefore, is only consistent when she passes by the doctrine of unity and commits herself to the Lutheran theory of justification.

The belief of the real and proper presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, according to the words of Scripture, is an article of catholic

faith. It is needless to quote the words of the Council of Trent on this matter, or those of the Lateran Council. We refer to Note A for the proof that it was taught by the Church from the beginning. There need be no dispute as to words or phrases. Things only are important. The English Churches reject any real presence of Christ in the sacrament, and are, therefore, heretical by the voice of antiquity. Article XXVIII., declaring against transubstantiation, says that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith." Can there be any plainer denial of any true presence of our Lord in the sacrament? If it be needed, it follows: "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Certainly, if the Body of Christ is in the sacrament, it should be worshipped. Article XXXI., however, puts the finishing stroke to all this picture. "The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain

or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." If Christ is present in the sacrament, He is the victim of salvation, and He is offered, not as a new sacrifice, but as a presentation and continuation of the one sacrifice. It cannot be otherwise. If He is not there, it is certainly a blasphemy to pretend to offer Him, or to fall down and adore the sacrament. Anglican writers of any note are entirely consistent with the language of this article. We add here the remarks appended to their Communion Office. "Whereas, it is ordained in this office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling. Yet, lest the same kneeling should, by any persons, out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved, it is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and, therefore, may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the nat-

ural body and blood of our Saviour, Christ, are in Heaven and not *here*, it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." We pass over the philosophy of this passage and its restrictions upon the omnipotence of God; but its doctrine is plain. The history of the Reformation in England, as it regards this very point, is an abundant proof of the violence which was necessary to weed out the old faith. The parliament of 1534 denied the supremacy of the Pope, but made no movement as to doctrine. The convocation, in 1536, among articles in many respects objectionable to Catholics, set forth "the necessity of auricular confession, the corporeal presence, the worship of images, the invocation of saints, and purgatory." In the parliament of 1539 six articles were established for abolishing diversity of opinion. The first affirms transubstantiation, and he who should write or speak against this article was condemned to be burnt. In "The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man," published by the king's authority in 1543, we find the same belief. When the new Prayer-book, drawn up by Cranmer, was published in 1549,

the act of parliament confirming its use excited great opposition; for, says Dr. Short (§ 313), "no opinion was entertained with so much earnestness on the part of the people as that of transubstantiation. Its friends regarded the suppression of it as the destruction of their chief spiritual hope." In 1553, the convocation assembled under Queen Mary, condemned the Prayer-book "as heretical, on account of the denial of transubstantiation which it contained," and set forth four articles, as follows: I. In the sacrament of the altar there is a true and real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in either kind. II. The fathers of the Lateran Council aptly expressed the mode of Christ's presence by the new term of transubstantiation, as the Nicene Fathers had expressed that the Son is of one substance with the Father by the new term "consubstantial." III. That, since we confess that the true Body and Blood of Christ is present in the sacrament, how can we but worship Him? IV. That this holy and life-giving and unbloody sacrifice we offer up for the healing of our infirmities, considering that there is on the holy table the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, there sacrificed by

the priest, though without blood-shedding."* Queen Elizabeth succeeded to the throne in 1558, and the first convocation assembled in her reign sent up an address to the upper house to be by them presented to the crown. The three first articles were: I. "That Christ is corporeally present in the sacrament." II. "That there is no other substance there but His Body and Blood." III. "That in the Mass there is a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and the living." Even after the new hierarchy of Elizabeth had been set up, and the Thirty-nine Articles confirmed by parliament, yet, according to Bishop Burnet, "the greater part of the nation still continued to believe in transubstantiation." Here we see arrayed against the Protestant establishment, not only the Catholic Church, but the very traditions of England herself. It would be worse than idle to dispute about terms. Two substances cannot coexist in the same space at the same time, and, therefore, if Christ be really present, the substance of bread cannot be, and transubstantiation is a necessity.

* Burnet, ii. 599, 600.

The theory of justification by faith alone was the basis of the whole Lutheran system, and to this the Anglican Churches are fully committed. It is asserted in the articles, and lies at the foundation of all their religious teaching.

"That we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as is more largely expressed in the homily of justification." (Art. XI.) Good works, as fruits of faith, are pleasing to God, but not meritorious; and works wrought before justification have the nature of sin. (Arts. XII., XIII.) The point of Luther's heresy was not to exalt the efficacy of faith already admitted in the Catholic Church, but to deny inherent righteousness, and with it to destroy the sacramental system. It makes justification forensic and unreal. The justified man is not truly just in God's sight, he only is esteemed so on account of the merits of another. It does away with the whole exterior of religion, and with the Church itself, which is the sacrament of unity. Christ's work in the restoration of man becomes only the imputation of His own merits, not the imparting of them; the accounting righteous, not the making us such. To this system, subversive of all priestly functions, the

Church of England is entirely bound; and she even goes further in her Seventeenth Article, and asserts the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, thereby denying the importance of any species of ecclesiastical intervention. Consistently, therefore, five of the sacraments are rejected, and Baptism and the Lord's Supper cease to be sacraments in the proper sense, since no grace is necessarily attached to them. The Catholic belief in purgatory, and the invocation of saints, are both condemned. The way of salvation is not through communion with the Church, and participation in her sacraments as the means of grace, but by the apprehension of Christ through faith, a belief in His merits and His power of justification. All other things may be commendable or edifying, they cannot be necessary. It will be difficult to see in this statement of doctrine any difference between the English Church and other Protestant bodies, whose plain professions are more logical, and whose position is far more reasonable. We believe that the majority of Episcopalians are far from accepting the pretensions made by those who are called High-Churchmen, that they have no wish to seem what they are not, and that they

are utterly opposed to any attempts to Romanize their communion. They openly acknowledge their sympathy with the reformers, whom they regard as the true fathers of their religious system. They will ever prevail in the Church of England, for they have reason on their side, and the incontestable argument of facts.

4. In answer to the plain language by which the Episcopal Churches are identified with the reform, it is sometimes stated that there are important points of distinction between them and the other Protestant communions. It is argued that they have the Catholic creeds, that their offices are drawn from ancient sources, and that instead of separating from the Church, like many followers of Luther and Calvin, they only legitimately reformed themselves by throwing aside superstitions and returning to primitive simplicity. As to the first point, the possession of the creeds avails very little, unless the living tradition of the Church preserves their proper signification. Several Protestant bodies confess the Apostles' Creed, but certainly not in the sense in which it had always been received. How, for example, can any Protestant have faith in "one Holy Catholic Church," when his

ideas have no distinctness whatever as to this point, and when to him the Church is neither tangible nor visible? The creeds are just as capable of misrepresentation as the Bible, and, therefore, the mere possession of them proves nothing. The only question is, are they held and understood in the true sense, for very few of the numerous reformed communions will dispute as to the articles of the Apostles' Creed. They may receive them differently, but they will not quarrel as to the words.

Secondly, as to the offices of the Anglican prayer-book, we confess that they are inconsistent with each other, and with the articles of their belief. But what does this argue? It shows the discrepancy, but does not prove that they who choose can hold Catholic doctrine, and still be good Episcopalians. The offices are not strictly dogmatic, while the articles are; and the real opinions of a Church are to be gathered from its symbols, and not from its forms of prayer. There ought to be no inconsistency, but when there is, the articles of faith are to decide the matter. The offices, too, were framed during the transition state of the Reformation, and being drawn more or less from

ancient sources, are likely to speak of doctrines practically abandoned. The baptismal office certainly teaches regeneration through that sacrament. Yet will any one say that this is the general doctrine of the English Church? I do not speak of the few who call themselves Anglo-Catholics, and have no sympathy with their spiritual mother. They are to be taken as the representatives of no Church, and can hardly account for themselves from one day to another. The consensus of Anglican divines is entirely against baptismal regeneration, which, practically held, would militate against their cardinal tenet of justification by faith only. If we are born again in baptism, we certainly become inherently just in God's sight. The utmost we were able to gather from the teachings of their doctors is, that this sacrament produces not a radical change, but a change of state.

The order for the administration of the Lord's Supper contains some things which seem to imply the real presence, but such meaning is taken away by other things which speak more loudly. The article (XXVIII.) positively denies any such belief, and the very language of the office goes to destroy whatever faith one might have tried

to accumulate. The receiver is told to feed upon Christ by faith, lest when the minister says to him, "The body of Christ," he be disposed to take such words literally. He kneels to receive the bread and wine, which act is explained by the rubric already quoted; but after communion, what remains of the elements (to use their own term) is sent around the church to be consumed. And very often they do not fare so well as this, for we ourselves have seen them put in any but reverent places, and have more than once known the sexton to have charge of the (consecrated) wine which remained. We have often seen at communion, in the Episcopal churches, the chancel-rail quite covered with the fragments of bread, of which no one seemed to take any particular notice. We are not blaming any one for this; we are only adducing it as proof that they have no idea that the bread is any thing more than bread. If they thought it was the body of their Lord, they surely would not treat it so. With our knowledge of facts, we cannot think of any thing more shocking than the supposition that any of their ministers have the power of consecration. That there may be a few excep-

tions to this state of things will certainly not affect our argument. They spring from individual views, and not from any teaching of their Church. Individuals may erect altars with all the insignia of the Catholic service, kneel with their backs to the congregation, use frankincense and candles, and embroider crosses on the ends of their black scarfs or on their white surplices; yet they will soon tire of this, for the majority of their communion will look at it as either child's play or an aping after ritualism totally foreign to any Protestant Church. And, while they thus gratify their love for the beautiful, these unfortunate adventurers are estranging themselves, day by day, from their own people, and gradually find the number of their friends diminishing. Shadows without substance and forms without any reality are of little value, and will not long satisfy an earnest heart. The world is quite logical in the conclusion that there is a place for every thing, and that every thing should be in its place. Catholic ceremonies belong to the Catholic Church; they have no place in a Protestant religion. We kneel towards our altars because our Lord is there present, and we bow down to adore

Him. To kneel to wood and stone, where there is no pretence of any divine presence, is not in accordance with an enlightened faith. The different parts of our ritual are meaning when taken with the harmonious whole; taken in a fragmentary state, and disjointed from their connection, they are entirely insignificant.

Thirdly, the claim that the English Church legitimately reformed itself is wholly untenable and contrary to facts. A Church may admit in itself corruptions of discipline, but if it admit corruptions of doctrine, it unchurches itself. When a body, professing to hold authority from Christ, loses the true faith, or so encumbers it by superstitions that it becomes valueless, it ceases to be in any sense a true Church. It is time, then, to form a new one, if one be necessary, as the old one has lost all virtue and right to influence men. God's revelation, so far as it depends upon the Church, is gone, and some other intervention is necessary. How can the authority which was not good enough to prevent corruption, be able to conduct a reformation? If one be attempted at all, it must be on the private judgment theory, and then there is no limit to

the reformation, and any pretence of Church authority is inconsistent.

But, in fact, the ecclesiastical body in England had very little to do with the Reformation. All the work was effected by the civil power, and the very first step was the silencing of the Church in the great movement in which she was only passive. We shall quote from Burnet's History of the Reformation and from Dr. Short, both Episcopal authorities. The convocation of the English Church was its legitimate council, and, two years before the abrogation by parliament of the Papal supremacy, it had been bound to make no canons without the king's assent. In 1532, this body was forced to the following submission: "That they would not enact, promulge, or put in execution any constitution to be made by them without the royal license; such was the trust they put in the king's (Henry VIII.) wisdom, goodness and zeal, and in his incomparable learning, far exceeding the learning of all other princes they had read of."* "They also offered to moderate or annul the constitutions already

* Burnet, Appleton's ed., iii., 117–20; iv., 434.

passed, according to his judgment." "By this," says Burnet, "all the opposition that the convocations would probably have given to every step that was afterwards made in the Reformation, was so entirely restrained, that the quiet progress of that work was owing to the restraints under which the clergy put themselves by their submission, and in this the whole body of the Reformed Church has cheerfully acquiesced, till within these few years that great endeavors have been made to blacken and disgrace it." During the reign of Edward VI., "the Popish party, according the same author, was yet so prevalent in both houses of convocation that Cranmer had no hopes of doing any thing until they were freed of the trouble which some of the great bishops gave them." When the prayer-book was set forth, it was by the royal authority, the clergy being not even consulted. "The power of giving licenses to preach was taken away from the bishops of each diocese, so that none might give them but the king and the Archbishop of Canterbury."* Cranmer prepared his articles of religion and published them, in 1553, by the royal authority

* Burnet, ii., 128.

alone. Says Bishop Short (§ 484): "From the title under which these articles were originally published, it might be supposed that they derived their authority from the sanction of the convocation; but if they were ever submitted to the upper house, which is very questionable, it is indubitable that they were never brought before the lower, while all the original mandates which remain prove that they were promulgated by the royal proclamation alone." The plan of reformation which was pursued by Cranmer was, in the words of the same author (Short, § 338), "to intrust the task of reforming any particular branch of Church matters to a committee of divines, appointed by the crown, sometimes on the ground of the ecclesiastical supremacy, and sometimes under an act of parliament, and then to sanction the result by a fresh bill, or by publishing it under the royal authority." "This method of proceeding may be esteemed very unconstitutional with regard to the convocation, but if the supreme authority be lodged in the civil magistrate, in him, too, must be vested the power of finally approving or rejecting all regulations with regard to the service of the Church." During Queen

Mary's short reign, the convocation was free once more, and we have already seen the spirit which it manifested. On the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, the ecclesiastical body declared itself in favor of Catholic doctrine and against the royal supremacy. Among the articles proposed in the first convocation of her reign were these: "That S. Peter and his lawful successors have the power of binding and loosing, of feeding and governing the Church," and "that the power of treating about doctrines, the sacraments, and the order of divine worship belongs only to the pastors of the Church." These articles had received many subscriptions in the universities, and at a time when the queen had forbidden the making of any canons by the convocation, under the old penalty of confiscation of property and exile. By brute force, the enactments of parliament, and the practical result of the royal supremacy, the new Church of Elizabeth was constructed, a body wholly subservient to her will, and bound hand and foot to the State. How any one can say, with all these facts before him, that the Church of England reformed itself, is more than we can comprehend.

5. Reflections such as we have made will certainly convince the most skeptical that all propositions for union, coming from the Anglican Communion, are unreal. A body which has no moral unity within itself, whose ecclesiastical existence depends upon division, can hardly propose a return to principles it has renounced. And there never has been any authoritative proposition for unity from those who alone have been entitled to make it. Certain individuals, whose position is most unhappy, since for them there is no Church authority, have spoken in mournful words of the evils of disunion, and avow themselves ready to give up all their Protestantism if the Holy See will only meet them with some corresponding concessions. We call these individuals unhappy, because, professing to be Churchmen, they really have no spiritual mother. They are willing to risk their salvation on the Church of England, and yet they treat her with all possible disrespect and disobedience. She disowns them, and yet they, by pure imagination, erect her into something which she denies herself to be. When will dreamers awake to the great fact that a Church knows best her own claims, and has the right to

speak for herself in all matters of doctrine? More obsequious followers of private judgment, from Luther down, cannot be found, since for them there is no infallible voice, not that of their own Church, which they are seeking to reform, and surely not that of the Catholic Church, to which they will not submit. What a proposition to make to a body which has rigidly maintained its own infallibility under all possible pressure! Compromise with us and bow down to our notions of truth, and then we will accept—not your decisions—but our own opinions. If such a catastrophe were possible, the pillar of the truth would crumble to atoms and men be left to their own unaided reason. But these are visionaries, whose consciences are better known to God than to us, and for whom every earnest heart should pray. There seems to be something mentally wrong in such inconsistency. We have, notwithstanding, in our day, an association within the Church of England, whose object is to pray and labor for unity. They have, for this purpose, even addressed the Holy See. One well acquainted with the real state of things can hardly repress a smile at the world of fiction in which they

dwell, seemingly knowing as little of their own Church as of the Catholic faith. We give here in full their letter to Cardinal Patrizi, with his reply, which well sums up many of our own arguments.

The *Union Review* publishes in original Latin, first, a letter to Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Holy Office, from one hundred and ninety-eight deans, canons, parish priests, and other priests of the Protestant Church of England; and, secondly, the cardinal's reply, which has a special interest just now, and a direct bearing upon Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon."

I.

To the Most Eminent and Reverend Father in Christ, the Lord Cardinal Patrizi, Prefect of the Holy Office:

Most Eminent Lord—We, the undersigned deans, canons, parish priests, and other priests of the Anglo-Roman Catholic Church, vehemently longing for visible reunion between all parts of the Christian family, according to the will of Christ, have read with great sorrow your

Eminence's letter to all the bishops of England. In this letter our society, instituted to promote the reunion of all Christianity, is accused of affirming in its programme that three communions—viz., the Roman Catholic, the Eastern, and the Anglican—claim for themselves, with equal right, the name of Catholic.

But our programme passed no judgment whatever on that question. What we said touched a question of fact, not a question of right. We only affirmed that the Anglican Church claims for itself the name of Catholic, and that is abundantly clear to all, both from the liturgy and from the articles of religion. Moreover, as to the intention of our society, it is asserted that our main object is that the three communions, in their integrity, and each persisting in its persuasion, may simultaneously combine into one.

Far from us and from our society be such a scheme, from which no ecclesiastical unity would be to be hoped, but the strife of brethren's hand-to-hand fight under one roof.

What we earnestly ask of Almighty God, and long for with all our hearts, is nothing but the ecclesiastical intercommunion which existed be-

fore the separation of East and West, an ecclesiastical intercommunion established and riveted by the profession of one and the same Catholic faith. And our society ought to cause you less displeasure for this reason, that abstaining from action, it only prays that, in the words of Christ our Lord, there may be one Shepherd and one flock. We have no other wish, and we profess this judgment and desire to your Eminence with as much sincerity of heart and honesty of words as we are capable of.

As to the periodical called the *Union Review*, between it and our society there is only a fortuitous conjunction, and, therefore, we are in no wise bound by its utterances. Various writers, indeed, utter their own opinions in that work, yet so as that by the evolution of their judgments the truth of the Catholic faith may shine forth more brightly. It is scarcely to be wondered at that this plan of co-operative writing is not in use at Rome, where the controversies of the day are rarely agitated, but in England, where almost every question is submitted to the public, none is brought to a right conclusion without a free discussion. To hasten that result we have already worked for many years.

Whatever may have been less perfect in the faith of the flock, in divine worship and in ecclesiastical discipline we have improved beyond our hope; and, not to be forgetful of other things, we have shown an amount of good-will towards the venerable Church of Rome, which has rendered us suspected in the eyes of some. We humbly profess ourselves your Excellency's servants, seekers after Catholic unity.

To this address, which received one hundred and ninety-eight signatures, Cardinal Patrizi replied as follows:

II.

Worthy and Dear Sirs—That, in your letter to me, you profess, with sincerity of heart and honesty of words, to desire that, according to the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, there may be one fold and one Shepherd, inspires this Sacred Congregation with a most pleasing hope that, by the grace of Jesus Christ, you will at length arrive at true unity. But you must beware lest, in seeking it, you deviate from

the path. And the Sacred Congregation much regrets that this has actually occurred to you by your adopting the notion that those associations of Christians belong to the true Church of Christ, as parts thereof, which boast that they have the inheritance of the priesthood and of the Catholic name, although they are divided and separated from the Chair of Peter. There is nothing more abhorrent to the government of the Catholic Church than that opinion. For the Catholic Church, as is pointed out in my letter to the Bishops of England, is that Church which, being built upon one Peter, presents itself a body knitted and kneaded together in the unity of faith and charity. (St. Ambros. de Offic. Minister, lib. 3, c. 3, No. 19.)

That this union of faith and charity, or of communion, by the irreformable institution of Christ, is not only a chief and fundamental property of the true Church, but also a most certain and ever visible mark by which the Church herself may be safely and easily distinguished from all sects, will be most evidently demonstrated to you (if you will consider the matter carefully and calmly) by the testimony of Holy Writ, and the remarkable metaphors,

parables, and figures by which the Church is delineated, and, so to speak, represented; also by the illustrious records of the Holy Fathers, and of the most ancient synods; also by the constant course of procedure which the Church, from her commencement, hath been wont to follow against heretics and schismatics of every sort, although many of them have claimed for themselves the inheritance of the Catholic name. As, then, the Church of Christ is called Catholic, because of the perfect unity of faith and communion, which, among all nations, and through every age, she most firmly retains; so, on account of the same unity, she is proclaimed Holy and Apostolic; and as without such unity she would cease, both *de jure* and *de facto*, to be Catholic, so she would also be immediately deprived of the marks of sanctity and of apostolic succession.

The Church of Christ never has lost its unity, and never will lose it, even for the briefest interval, because, according to the Divine promise, she is to last forever. But how can the Church be supposed to be of everlasting duration, if each successive age brought with it a new form and semblance in its essential state; even as is

the case with ever-changing worldly things; and if the Church herself might thus gradually decline from that unity of faith and communion in which she was founded by Jesus Christ, and then propagated by the apostles? For S. Ambrose says: "The kingdom of the Church shall remain forever; therefore because faith is individual, the body is one." (In Lub. lic. vii., No. 91.) And if the Church of Christ be indefectible, it follows that she must be called, and must be believed to be, infallible in delivering the teaching of the Gospel; and it is an unshaken dogma of the Catholic faith that Christ our Lord, by a miraculous gift, conferred this prerogative of infallibility upon His Church, of which He is the head, spouse, and corner-stone. And, indeed, what sane man can suppose that the public and solemn government of the Church is liable to error?—a government which was instituted by Christ on purpose that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive (Ephesians, iv. 14); a government which He promised should never be deserted by His presence, and should

be instructed in all truth by the Holy Ghost; a government by means of which He willed all nations to be called to the obedience of faith, and so to receive the doctrine of things to be believed and done, that whoever should not believe the preaching of the apostles and of their legitimate successors, should be condemned; a government to which He gave the function and authority of prescribing the form of sound words in which all the teachable ones of God should agree. Hence Paul calls the Church the "pillar and ground of truth." (1 Timothy, iii. 15.) But how would the Church be the ground of truth, unless the truth were safely to be sought from her? The holiest Fathers unanimously say and preach that in the unity of the Church the unity of Christ's faith and teaching is so fixed that one cannot be disjointed from the other; which also is the drift of that golden sentence of S. Cyprian, that the Church is the domicile of unity and truth. (Epist. viii. ad Com. ap. Constant., No. 1.) Nor has the Catholic Church ever had a doubt of the prerogative promised to her, and communicated by the constant presence of Christ and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, whenever she has undertaken to

settle controversies of faith, to interpret the sense of Holy Scriptures, and to put to rout errors opposed to the deposit of revelation intrusted to her. For she hath always put forth and propounded her dogmatic definitions as a certain and immutable rule of faith; to which, as a rule of faith, every one was bound to give his interior assent without doubt, suspicion, or hesitation; whereas, those who contumaciously opposed those definitions were adjudged to have thereby made shipwreck concerning the truth necessary for obtaining salvation, and no longer to belong to the fold of Christ. These things show more clearly the absurdity of that figment of a Catholic Church made up of a coalition of three communions. The promoters of the figment are necessarily compelled to impugn the infallibility of the Church.

Further, it is equally certain that Jesus Christ, in order that unity of faith and communion might be begotten and preserved forever in the Church, and that, by the appointment of a head, the occasion of schism might be removed (S. Jerome, lib. i., adv. Jovin., No. 26), did choose, by a special Providence, blessed Peter, before the other apostles, as their chief and a conspicu-

ous centre, and the bond of unity, and built His Church upon him, and gave him the supreme charge and authority (to be continued to his successors in every age) of feeding the whole flock, of confirming the brethren, and of binding and loosing over the whole world. This is the Catholic dogma. It was received from the mouth of Christ; it has been handed down and defended by the perennial preaching of the Fathers; and the Universal Church in every age hath most holily retained it, and has often confirmed it by the decrees of its Supreme Pontiffs and councils against the errors of innovators. Wherefore that alone hath always been believed to be the Catholic Church which coheres in faith and communion with the chair of the Roman Pontiffs, the successors of Peter; and S. Cyprian therefore calls that chair the root and matrix of the Catholic Church (Epis. iv. ad Cornelium ap. Constant., No. 3), and the Fathers and councils designate this chair alone by the antonomastic appellation of the Apostolic Chair. Sacerdotal unity took its rise from it. (S. Cyprian, Epist. xii. ad Corn. ap. Constant., No. 14.) From it the rights of holy communion flow to all. (Epist. concilii Aquileiensis ad Gratianum

imp. an. 381, inter Epistolas S. Ambrosii.) In it Peter always lives, and presides over, and leads the seekers after the truth of faith. (S. Peter Chrysol. epist. ad. Eutych.; Act. iii. concilii Ephes. ap. Harduin, 1, 1748.) S. Augustine, trying to recall the Donatists, who were convicted of schism, to the root and the vine from which they had departed, uses an argument common with the older fathers: "Come, brethren, if you wish to be grafted on the vine. It pains us to see you lying cut off. Count the priests from the very Chair of Peter, and, in that series of fathers, see who succeeded whom. That is the rock which the proud gates of hell conquer not." (Psalm. in part. Donati.) By which alone he sufficiently shows that he is not in the Catholic Church who is not in the Church of Peter, in which is laid the foundation of Catholic unity. And, in the like sense, is S. Jerome, to whom every one was profane who was not associated in communion with the Chair of Peter, and with the pontiff who sat therein. "Following none at first but Christ (thus he to Damasus), I am associated in communion with your blessedness, *i. e.*, with the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is built upon that rock.

Whoever shall eat the lamb outside of that house is profane. Whoever is not in the ark of Noah shall perish in the deluge. Whoever gathereth not with thee scattereth"—that is, who belongs not to Christ belongs to anti-Christ (Epist. 14, al. 57, ad Damas., No. 2); and so S. Optatus, who celebrates that singular chair, known to all, placed at Rome, in which unity must be so preserved by all that he is a schismatic and a heretic who over against that singular chair places any other. (De Schism Donatist., lib. ii., No. 2.) And rightly so; for, in the ordination and succession of the Roman pontiffs, as S. Irenæus openly proclaims to all, that tradition and publication of truth in the Church reaches us which came from the apostles; and this is the fullest evidence that it is one and the same vivifying faith which, from the apostles until now, has been preserved and delivered in truth. (Lib. iii. contra Hæres., cap. iii., No. 3, vi., vet. interpr.)

Therefore, if it is the proper and perpetual mark of the true Church of Christ, that in the utmost unity of faith and social charity it is contained, flourishes, and, like a city placed on a hill, is evident at all times to all; and if,

again, Christ has willed the Apostolic Chair of Peter to be the organ, bond, and centre of that unity, it follows that all societies whatever separated from the external and visible communion and obedience of the Roman Pontiff, cannot be the Church of Christ, and cannot in any way whatever belong to the Church of Christ—to that Church which in the creed, after the praise of the Trinity, is proposed as the object of our belief—a Church Holy; a Church One; a Church True; a Church Catholic (S. Augustin de Symb. ad Catech., cap. vi.)—a Church which is called Catholic, not by its own children, but by all its enemies (S. Aug. de vera Relig., cap. vii.); and has obtained the name of Catholic so exclusively that, though all heretics wish themselves to be called Catholics, still, when any stranger asks where do men meet for the Catholic service, no heretic dares to point to his own Church or his own house. (S. Aug. contr. epist. fundam., cap. iv., No. 5.) A Church through which Christ imparts the benefits of the redemption as through a body most entirely joined to Himself—a Church from which whoever is separated (though he may deem that he is living laudibly, still for the sole crime that

he is severed from the unity of Christ), shall not have life, but the anger of God abideth with him. (S. Aug., cap 141, al. 152, No. 5.) It follows, also, both that the name of Catholic cannot belong by right to such societies, and, also, that it cannot be given them, in fact, without manifest heresy.

Thence, worthy and very dear sirs, you will see why this Sacred Congregation hath been so careful, that the faithful of Christ should not be suffered to co-operate with the society recently founded by you for the purpose, as you say, of promoting Christian unity, and should not favor it in any way. You will also see that every attempt to conciliate concord must necessarily fail unless it be reduced to those principles according to which the Church was founded by Christ in the beginning, and afterward, in every future age, propagated by the apostles and their successors, one and the same over the whole world; principles which are clearly exposed in the celebrated formula of Hormisdas, which it is certain was approved by the whole Catholic Church. Lastly, you will see that the Œcumenical intercommunion of which you speak before the Photian schism, existed be-

cause the Eastern Churches had not yet departed from the due obedience of the Apostolic Chair, and that it is not sufficient for the restoration of this most desired intercommunion, to lay aside hostility and hatred toward the Roman Church, but that you ought, according to the precept and institute of the Church, altogether to embrace the faith and communion of the Roman Church; since, as venerable Bede, that splendid ornament of your nation, saith, "Whoever separate themselves in any manner from the unity of the faith, or from the society of him (blessed Peter), such can neither be absolved from the bonds of sinners nor enter the gates of the kingdom of heaven." (Hom. in natali SS. Petri et Pauli.)

Worthy and dear sirs, would that, as the Catholic Church has been proved to be one, and unable to be parted or divided, you would no longer hesitate to throw yourselves into the bosom of that Church, which, by the confession of the human race, from the Apostolic See through the succession of its bishops, while heretics have barked in vain around it, hath attained the pinnacle of power. (S. Aug. de util. credendi, c. xvii., No. 35.) Would that

the Holy Spirit would deign, without delay, to complete and finish what He hath begun in you, by giving you good-will toward His Church. Our most holy Lord Pope Pius IX., together with his Sacred Congregation, wish this for you with his whole heart, and earnestly beseeches the God of Mercy and the Father of Light that you may all of you at length fly from your disinherited state of separation to the inheritance of Christ—to the true Catholic Church, to which your ancestors certainly belonged before the lamentable separation of the sixteenth century—and that you may happily deserve to receive the root of charity in the bond of peace and in the partnership of unity. (S. Aug., ep. 61, al. 223, No. 2, cap. 69, l. 238, No. 1.) Fare ye well.

C. CARD. PATRIZI.

ROME, *this 8th day of November*, 1865.

PART SECOND.

THE POSITION OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

It is not our purpose to treat at any length the question between the Catholic Church and the schismatical bodies of the East. We only propose, as it comes within the scope of this brief work, to allude to their present condition, their position in reference to Christian unity, and the view which they take of Protestantism, so far as it may be known. These are the only important points for the more complete understanding of the subject presented by us, as the all-important topic of the day.

The Eastern Churches, as they now stand, comprise what is called the Greek Orthodox Communion, the Armenians, the Jacobites, the Copts, and the Nestorians. The Greeks are divided into three distinct bodies between which intercommunion prevails—the subjects of the sultan, the subjects of the czar, and

the inhabitants of the kingdom of Greece. In the Turkish patriarchate of Constantinople there are about twelve millions of souls, besides nearly three millions who belong to the empire of Austria. The Greek National Church numbers six hundred thousand. The Russian communion has passed through several forms of ecclesiastical government. First, there was a hierarchy of diocesan bishops, next a patriarchate at Moscow, and, lastly, a governing synod under the direct control of the emperor. Thus this great ecclesiastical body has fallen virtually into the hands of the czar; and, as the Greeks of the sultan's dominion have no other protector, he has become the actual head of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The pretensions of Constantinople are gone, and even Moscow has bowed down to its royal master. The population of the Russian communion has been estimated at forty-seven millions.

The Armenian heretics, still retaining the error of Eutyches, are gradually dying out, and even between themselves there is division. In Persia they incline to the Russians, while in Turkey they seem disposed to embrace the Catholic religion. The Jacobites, or Syrian

Monophysites, and the Copts, or African Monophysites, are not very numerous. They still deny the proper incarnation of our Lord, by confounding his two natures. The Nestorians, who separate His two natures, still linger in various parts of Asia, in a lifeless and fruitless state. There is some doubt as to the orders of the Copts, but all the other sects are considered to have a validly ordained priesthood.

The position of these Churches in reference to unity is either schismatical or heretical. The heretical communions owe their existence to the teachings of Eutyches, Nestorius, Arius, and other leaders, who denied the true doctrine concerning our Lord, and were condemned by the Church. They are as much separated from the Eastern orthodox bodies as from the Holy See. Yet, even in their decay, they are a witness in behalf of the ancient traditions which they received from apostolic sources. All of them bear testimony in favor of the doctrines universally rejected by Protestants, such as the Sacrifice of the Mass, the real presence in the Blessed Eucharist, and the invocation of saints.

The Greek Schism, as it is generally called, was a distinct and positive rending of Catholic

unity, at the end of a long quarrel incited and maintained by ambitious and political motives. Constantinople was once a place of no repute—a small see dependent on the province of Heraclea—and its bishop was the pastor of the few fishermen around the Bosphorus. Rome, the seat of the Cæsars, was the mistress of the world, and there it pleased the God-Man to erect the throne of S. Peter. When the emperor became Christian, a divine direction impelled him to move the seat of his government to the East, to a city called after his own name. The city of Constantinople became, then, the civil rival of Rome, and sought, shortly after, to be its ecclesiastical rival. This spirit first openly manifested itself at the Council of Chalcedon (451), where an attempt was made to give the second rank among apostolic sees to Constantinople, and to build an authority on its civil preeminence. The Synod of Trullo (691), which was intended as a supplement to the Sixth General Council, was another attempt on the part of the Eastern bishops to attack the Latin customs and arrive at independence in discipline. Soon after this arose the great controversy in regard to the use of images, which was really the war

of the emperor against Christendom, for Leo, who had derived his ideas from Jewish and Mohammedan sources, was determined to rule the Church. Here the subserviency of the East plainly appears, from the fact that he was able to gather a synod of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, who were made to condemn the use of images and to forbid their veneration. The Second General Council of Nice (787) amply vindicated the Catholic doctrine, and made the authority of the Roman Pontiff still stronger, since all the world was forced to look to the successor of S. Peter as the stability of the common faith, and the only defence against imperial oppression or Moslem tyranny.

In the year 846 the See of Constantinople was governed by Ignatius, a prelate of sincere piety, who, in the discharge of his duty, was obliged to come in conflict with the vices of the court. Forced to inveigh against the immorality of the emperor, after repeated warnings he excommunicated the favorite minister who had pandered to all his wickedness. The consequence was a conspiracy against the patriarch, which ended in his expulsion. The Holy Pontiff would not yield, and could not be induced by threats or

flattery to resign his episcopate. The imperial party, however, found a tool for its purposes in a layman by the name of Photius, a member of the emperor's household. After six days his consecration was effected at the hands of a deposed bishop, and he was thrust into the see of Ignatius. One thing now remained, to obtain the recognition of the Holy See. To this end, an imposing embassy of bishops was sent to Rome, with many rich presents from the emperor. The Pope was unwilling to act without first sending his legates to the scene of conflict. They were sent, and, corrupted by the arts of the court, deposed Ignatius, in a synod held under their authority. The truth, however, at last reached the ears of the Sovereign Pontiff, and the whole proceeding of his legates was condemned, and Photius declared a usurper. But for the power of the court, the unhappy strife would have come to an end Yet the imperial arm was too strong to submit at once, and so Photius calls together a council of bishops, under the protection of the empire, and passes canons against the Latin doctrine and discipline. He attacked the fast of Saturday, and in matters of faith objected to the procession of the Holy

Ghost from the Son. These, with other trifling matters, were made the foundation of a futile condemnation of the Western Church. When the Emperor Michael died, a change took place under the reign of his successor. Photius was driven from Constantinople, Ignatius was restored to his see, and the Eighth General Council, assembled in the church of St. Sophia (869), pronounced anathema against Photius and all who should remain in his communion. A special condemnation was also passed upon all who should, by words or deeds, attack the See of S. Peter. Against this decree not even Photius could object, for he himself had acknowledged, in the most public way, the authority of the Holy See. But the struggle was not over. The tide of imperial patronage turned. Ignatius escaped another expulsion by death, and Photius returned to the contest, which, after varying fortunes, ended at last in his discomfiture. No open schism was effected at this time, though the seeds of lasting jealousy were sown in the East, and the elements of a rupture were prepared. It was reserved for Michael Cerularius, patriarch in the eleventh century, to complete the separation to which so many

causes had disposed the Eastern Churches. This prelate, without any provocation, and with no motive but that of ambition, began anew the war upon the Latins, framed accusations against the Pope, and attempted to enforce the Greek rite throughout the East, and to drive home the apostolic missionaries who were in his patriarchate. This violent rending of Catholic unity could not pass unnoticed, and the Holy See sent legates to warn the patriarch, and, if possible, to persuade him to a reconciliation. But there was no disposition for peace. He persisted in refusing all communion with the West, and in denying the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son. Thus it happened that, in the year 1054, the legates of Rome laid the writ of excommunication upon the altar of S. Sophia, and pronounced anathema upon all who should deny the received Catholic doctrine. Such was the end of jealousies and divisions fostered by the civil power for its own aggrandizement, and nursed during many years of conflict. But the final result was the destruction of that imperial arm which had been raised against the unity of the Church. The Greek empire crumbled into dust; the glory departed from the diadem of

the Cæsars. The Moslem power seemed to threaten the entire destruction of Christianity, passing over the entire East like a devastating flood, and obliterating the traces of ancient sees whose candles had long before gone out in darkness. The city of Constantine fell; the crescent replaced the cross on its towers, and the days of the Greek empire were numbered.

From this unhappy day the greatest change has been perceptible in the condition of the Eastern Church. Before the separation, frequent heresies and constant disputations had weakened its life and diminished its fruitfulness. The power to grow, which belongs to the one true vine, seemed to be leaving it, and the Latin missions were carried into its very borders. But when once unity was broken, a blight seemed to fall upon every thing; there was a worm at the root of the tree, and decay of spiritual life was everywhere apparent. With servile submission to royal authority, it became the creature of the monarch. The sultan bound it hand and foot, and it only found escape from abject servitude to a Mohammedan power by the rise of the great Russian empire in 1687. Pitiable spectacle this of a Church which had

been glorious for its saints, confessors, and martyrs! So completely were the Eastern Churches in the hands of the Moslem oppressor, that he seized upon all the holy places which had been the common treasure of Christendom, and began to threaten the West with the same destruction. Then was uplifted the mighty arm of Christian chivalry, and armies rushed under the banner of the Cross to deliver the soil which the footsteps of the God-Man had hallowed. During these contests we find the ecclesiastical leaders of the East unfaithful, and the emperors deceitful. The Latins were obliged to fight their battles without them, and sometimes against them, and had there been any disposition for unity, it might, more than once, have been effected. Yet, true to its mission, the Catholic faith went on its victorious way, gathering new converts in the very heart of schism, and keeping its faithful guard upon Mount Calvary. "More than five centuries have elapsed," says a recent traveller, "since the disciples of S. Francis took possession of the sanctuaries of Palestine, and, despite persecutions of every kind, inseparable from a life passed in the midst of Mussulman barbarity,

they have stood by the post of honor. The French kingdom of Jerusalem, which it took prodigies of valor to found, could only live out eighty-eight years; and yet a few men who go barefoot, with a linen cassock and white cord, with no other arms than prayer, no other buckler than the persevering energy of their faith, succeed each other, century after century, around Calvary and the crib of Bethlehem." Since the first separation, the Holy See has never ceased its efforts to restore the waste places of the East; and when the prospects of union have seemed bright, Grecian duplicity has frustrated the plans of many a pious pontiff. Sometimes the emperors would interfere, and send embassies to the Pope, begging for reconciliation. Then, after the end was almost reached, the policy of the court would change, either because it had obtained the relief it sought, or because the opposition was too strong at home. In the year 1339, the emperor sent to the Pope at Avignon, with the most sincere desire to put an end to the schism; and the learned abbot whom he commissioned as his ambassador, himself submitted to the Catholic Church when he found no way of accomplishing his mission. John V.

also took up the same task and failed, although he repeatedly swore allegiance to the Sovereign Pontiff. At the commencement of the fifteenth century, John VI. arrived at Rome with a brilliant train, accompanied with a large deputation of the clergy, prepared to treat on the subject of reunion, and, in fact, to submit themselves. The Pope met them with every encouragement, held a synod in Ferrara, which he afterwards concluded at Florence (1439), and the form of union which he prescribed was actually signed. This form was a solemn renunciation of their error in denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, the withdrawal of their objections to the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Holy See. Such were its words: "I confess the Roman Pontiff to be the true successor of S. Peter, the prince of the apostles, the true vicar of Christ, the head of the Universal Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that he has received a plenary power from our Lord of feeding and ruling the Church of God." Yet this reconciliation did not last, for when the embassy returned to the East, a storm of opposition arose, and nearly all

shamefully retracted. The part of the empire already subdued by the Turks declared decisively against any connection with the West, and although John VI. strove, by every means in his power, to uphold the compact, his exertions were fruitless. Some of the bishops were anxious to remain faithful, but their voices were unheard amid the clamor of the multitude. The Council of Lateran, in 1442, saw another attempt at reconciliation, which also failed, because the Greeks were insincere, and only sought temporal relief. From that day the Eastern Churches slumbered under the oppression of the sultan, until the great power of Russia became its defence. In later days, there have been more tokens of life, but there is still the same subserviency to civil power. The Roman Pontiffs have, however, labored incessantly to restore unity, and only await the first dispositions of return to welcome back to the one fold those who have so grievously suffered by disunion. The Church has been represented in every clime, and Latin priests are found even in the domain of heresy and schism. Ancient rites, under the obedience of the Holy See, testify to the one faith and the energy of the true Spouse of

Christ. The Maronites, having their centre at Antioch, are in a very flourishing condition, and number more than two hundred thousand. The Melchite, or Catholic Greek Rite, numbers over five millions in Turkey, in the islands, and in Russia. This communion has had to merit a confessor's glory, amid the fury of persecution, exile, and death. The Syrian Catholics in Mesopotamia and in India cannot fall short of two hundred thousand souls. To these rites are to be added the Armenian and Chaldean, besides which there are Copts and Abyssinians, under the direction of Vicars Apostolic. Thus, not only by words, but by deeds of persevering labor, has the Church proved her charity and zeal for unity.

As regards the exact doctrinal position of the separated Eastern Churches, we must learn it from their authorized standards, and from such synods as they have held since their separation. They agree with nearly all the articles of the Catholic faith, though their discipline is different. They reject the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, although some writers believe that rejection arose from a misunderstanding of terms. They deny the supremacy

of the Bishop of Rome, and do not receive the later general councils. Their internal condition is not said to be an index of any great degree of vitality. Ignorance prevails to a lamentable extent, even among the clergy, and the rules of discipline are very much relaxed.

So far as Protestantism is concerned, their position is in no way equivocal. They hold to the ancient traditions, and have no sympathy with the bodies which have sprung from the Reformation. They have plainly condemned the errors of Luther, and have faithfully refused communion to all of the Protestant sects.

Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Alexandria, and afterwards of Constantinople, became a convert to the new opinions, and his history shows us how they were received in the East. This extraordinary man was born in 1572. Like many of his countrymen, he was driven by the dearth of educational establishments at home to betake himself to the universities of the West. From Venice he went to Padua, and thence to some of the most famous schools in Europe. He visited Geneva and Holland, and probably travelled as far as England. It is certain that he imbibed Calvinistic and Lutheran doctrines,

which he endeavored to engraft upon the Oriental system. He returned home, and used all his efforts to oppose any reconciliation with the See of Rome. In 1602, he was made patriarch of Alexandria, and, after several efforts, was elected to the See of Constantinople in 1621. During all this time he was in correspondence with the leaders of the Reformation. Having reached the height of his ambition, he began in earnest the work he had proposed. Identifying himself openly with the Dutch and English ministers, he published, in 1633, his confession of faith, which caused the most unparalleled excitement in the Greek communion. The storm raged around him with such violence, that intrigues with the court were his only means of safety. Yet, in spite of all his influence, the opposition of his own Church was so great, that he was deposed. The sultan, then in want of means, offered the see to the highest bidder, and in this way Cyril was able to accomplish his restoration. Yet his triumph was of short duration, for in one year his great antagonist, Cyril of Beræa, supplanted him, and the war went on secretly and openly, until the unfortunate man was apprehended for treasonable designs against

the sultan, and, whether guilty or innocent, was put to a violent death. His successor then called a synod, in which he professed his willingness to submit to the Roman Pontiff, and condemned all the new doctrines which had been advanced. The following are a few of the anathemas pronounced by the Council of Constantinople in 1638: "To Cyril, believing that the saints are not our mediators and intercessors with God, anathema. To Cyril, who teaches that man is not endowed with free will, but that every man has the power of sinning, but not the power of doing good, anathema. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that there are not seven sacraments, and falsely asserts that only two were by Christ, in the Gospel, handed down to us, that is to say, Baptism and the Eucharist, anathema. To Cyril, teaching that the bread and wine are not changed, by the blessing of the priest and the descent of the Holy Ghost, into the real body and blood of Christ, anathema. To Cyril, who teaches and believes that the faithful, who have fallen asleep in piety and penitence, are not, after death, assisted by the alms of their relatives, and the prayers of the Church, anathema." Four synods were held shortly after,

which endorsed this condemnation, that of Jerusalem; that of Constantinople, 1641; the synod of Jassy, in 1642; and, lastly, that of Bethlehem, in 1672; whose decisions are received throughout the whole Greek communion. We subjoin the doctrine of this latter council concerning the Holy Eucharist, which is a sufficient evidence of its antagonism to every species of Protestantism. We quote from Hardouin XI., p. 250, ch. xv.: "But that the integrity of the sacraments necessarily requires the use of some terrestrial thing, we hold altogether alien from Christian doctrine, namely, as contrary to the sacrament of the Eucharist, which, instituted by the substantial Word and sanctified by the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is perfected by the presence of the thing signified, to wit, the body and blood of Christ. And, indeed, it is necessarily perfected in itself before it is used. For if it were not, he who ill-uses it would not eat and drink judgment to himself, since he would but take a little bread and wine." Chap. xviii.: "In the celebration, therefore, of this sacrament, we believe our Lord Jesus Christ to be present, not, indeed, in a figure or image, nor by a certain excellence (as in other sacraments)

of grace, nor by a simple presence such as some Fathers have acknowledged even in Baptism, nor by a conjunction, as that the divinity of the word is hypostatically united to the proposed bread of the Eucharist, as the Lutherans now ignorantly and miserably think, but truly and really, so that the consecration of the bread and wine having been made, the bread is transmuted, transubstantiated, converted, passes away, truly, into the identical true body of the Lord, which was born at Bethlehem of the ever-Virgin, was baptized in Jordan, suffered, was buried; which rose again, ascended, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, will come at last in the clouds of heaven; but that the wine is converted and transubstantiated into the identical true blood of the Lord, which flowed from Him, hanging on the cross for the life of the world. Likewise, after the consecration of the bread and wine, we believe that the substance neither of bread nor of wine any longer remains, but the body itself, and blood itself of the Lord, under the accidents of bread and wine." "Likewise, that the same body and blood of the Lord, in the mystery of the Eucharist, are to be worshipped with supreme honor, and adored

with the worship of *Latria*, for one is the worship of the Holy Trinity, and that of the body and blood of the Lord. Likewise, that true and propitiatory is the sacrifice, which for all the faithful, as well living as dead, and for the good of all is offered, as in the prayers of this sacrament is expressed."

The majority of Protestants are consistent enough to recognize the utter antagonism between themselves and the Churches of the East. If they are separated from the Holy See, their doctrines are not more acceptable than those of Catholics. Yet the few theorizers in the Anglican communion whose view of unity we have noticed, are quite anxious to obtain some recognition from a body of Apostolic origin having unquestionable orders. We have read of the curious results of this anxiety in England, and we have seen them in our own country. We have seen a Nestorian bishop, an avowed heretic on the great truth of the incarnation, most cordially welcomed into Episcopal chancels, and a priest, whose standing in his own country was not well authenticated, invited to celebrate Mass at one of their altars. If

we mistake not, the Protestant Episcopal bishops have had the matter of communion with the Greek Church before them in their general convention. Yet have these theorizers succeeded in gaining any recognition whatever from these ancient Churches, to whom they would be so subservient? We have not heard that they have. Every attempt at intercommunion, so far as we know, has signally failed. Would it not be better, then, to tell the simple truth, and call things by their right names, confessing that transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, and the doctrine of the seven sacraments are just as unpalatable in the creed of Constantinople as in that of Rome? The Non-jurors, isolated from even their own national establishment, made strenuous efforts to gain the sympathy of the East, which resulted in a total failure; and they were in a position to accept or deny almost any doctrines, being only a handful of men, without allegiance to any ecclesiastical government. We will now add a very strange history, as it is told by the person most interested, who certainly had no temptations to exaggerate the peculiarities of his position. He had adopted the Anglo-Catholic theory of unity, and

resolved, therefore, to try by personal experience the real attitude of the Russian communion. Finding no support from the bishops of his own country, he obtained some countenance in Scotland, and at last joined himself to a prelate residing in Paris, and calling himself "Bishop of the Scots, by the grace of God." What this Bishop of the Scots had to do in France is, of course, left to the High-Anglican to determine. From our point of view it is somewhat a novel position. From him, however, our adventurer obtained letters such as might almost have emanated from the Pope, filled with Catholic assumptions quite unsupported by the reality. The holy synod at S. Petersburg asked for information as to the bearer of the letter, and the Church from which he came. The bearer, a deacon in the English Church, had not asked for any recognition of his orders, but only to be admitted to holy communion. The reply was as follows, in a decree made the 21st of December, 1842: "Seeing that the British Church has never yet, by any synodal act, expressed her purpose of restoring that union with our orthodox communion, which she has lost, by disavowing all

dogmas contrary to our confession; and seeing that the present letters express nothing more than the opinions of individuals, the holy synod cannot, for these reasons, admit the petitioner to the communion of our Church, otherwise than by the rite prescribed for converts from heterodoxy."* More explicit statements were then asked for, and the precise heresies of the British Churches were demanded. The first point was the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, after which the thirty-nine articles were taken up, and fifty-eight heretical propositions were found to be contained in them. "The arch-priest then told me," says our historian, "that besides confessing that all these propositions were contained in the thirty-nine articles, I must renounce and anathematize both the said propositions themselves and the articles from whence they were taken, and the British Church, which imposes such articles as a confession of the true faith upon her members." "And I was bidden to take notice that it was not enough to have said anathema to the heresies objected, unless I said it also to the thirty-

* Rev. W. Palmer, Appeal to the S. Church, p. 136.

nine articles, and to the Church which maintained in those articles the same heresies as her confession of faith."* Lately a Russian divine, Dr. J. J. Overbeck, has written a work in which he meets, on the part of the orthodox Russian Church, the advances of the "Anglo-Protestant Society for the union of Christendom." He says "the orthodox Catholic Church (meaning his own communion) does not recognize the English Church to be a Church in her meaning of the word, any more than the Lutheran, Reformed, or any other Protestant Church. With such a heretical Church (the English) the orthodox Church could never allow her bishops to transact. With individuals she will be most happy to treat, but an English Church she does not know, and may not know, as long as she preserves pure orthodoxy."

Catholics have great hopes, and send up to God many prayers for the separated Eastern Churches. One of the very first acts of the present glorious Pontiff, Pius IX., was to send a delegation to urge their return to unity.

* Appeal, p. 274.

They are a perpetual witness against Protestantism of every kind, and will, no doubt, in God's good time, be brought back to the "one fold" from which they have wandered. Having preserved in schism the traditions of the apostolic day, they have no rightful home out of the one house of the faithful, or estranged from the "one body" which liveth unto God, and is "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all."

NOTES.

NOTE A.

We propose, in this note, to give a few testimonies from antiquity in favor of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist, the invocation of saints, and purgatory. Our citations shall be very brief, and are given here only because we did not wish to obstruct too much the course of argument in the body of the work.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

The ancient liturgies are of the highest authority to all who desire to know the practice of the primitive Church. These liturgies are supposed to be derived from three great sources, or originals, that of S. James, that of S. Mark, and the Roman liturgy. They are certainly of very high antiquity, though their precise date cannot be traced. From the testimony of the Fathers, there is good reason to believe that none of these liturgies were committed to writing before the fourth century. They were recited from memory, which, in the early disci-

pline of the Church and its struggles with paganism, was deemed the only safe method. Any one who desires to see them can consult Mabillon and Renaudot. We shall only say that they all agree in containing the narrative of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and in a prayer that God will make or change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. They also contain prayers for the faithful departed, and generally the invocation of the saints in terms more or less direct.

We proceed to quote several of the Christian fathers:

S. Ignatius, a contemporary of the Apostles and Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 69:

"They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again."—*Ep. to the Smyrneans.*

S. Justin, A. D. 139:

"For we do not receive these things as common bread and common drink, but in the same

manner as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, being made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; even so we have been taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the prayer of the word which came from Him, by which (food) our blood and flesh are nourished by transmutation, is both flesh and blood of that same incarnate Jesus."—*Apol. I.*, § 65–6.

S. Athanasius, A. D. 360:

"Thou wilt see the Levites bearing bread and a chalice of wine, and arranging the table. As long as the supplications and prayers as yet take not place, there is simply the bread and the cup; but after that the great and marvellous prayers have been completed, then the bread is the body, and the cup the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. This bread and this cup are simply such, as long as the prayers and supplications have not yet taken place, but after that the great prayers and holy supplications have been sent on high, the Word descends into that bread and that cup, and it is His body."

S. Cyril, of Jerusalem, A. D. 363:

"He himself having declared and said, con-

cerning the bread, 'This is My body,' who shall dare to doubt henceforward? And He Himself having settled and said, 'This is My blood,' who shall ever doubt saying, this is not His blood? He once, at Cana of Galilee, turned water into wine—which is akin to blood—and is He undeserving of belief when He turned wine into blood? These things having learned, and being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread, even though sensible to the taste, but Christ's body; and what seems wine is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but Christ's blood."—*Catech.*, *I.*, 4.

S. Gregory of Nyssa, A. D. 370:

"The body of Christ, by the indwelling of the God-Word, was transmuted into the divine dignity. Rightly, therefore, do I believe now, also, that the bread that is sanctified by the Word of God is transmuted into the body of the God-Word."—*Orat. Catech. Magn.*, ch. xxxvii.

S. Ambrose, A. D. 385:

"Perhaps thou wilt say, I see a different thing; how is it that you assert to me that I shall receive the body of Christ? It yet re-

mains for us to prove this also. How many examples shall we use? Let us prove that this is not what nature formed, but what the benediction has consecrated; and that the force of the benediction is greater than the force of nature, because by the blessing even nature is changed." . . . . . "The Lord Jesus Himself cries out, This is My body. Before the benediction of heavenly words another species is named; after the consecration His body is signified. Himself declares it His own blood. Before the consecration it is called another thing; after consecration it is called blood. And thou sayest, Amen, that is, it is true. What the mouth speaks let the inward mind confess; what language expresses, let thought feel."—*De Mysteriis*, ch. viii. 9.

S. John Chrysostom, A. D. 387:

"Christ is present, and now He that set forth that table, the same sets forth this now. For it is not man that makes the things that lie open to view become Christ's body and blood, but that same Christ who was crucified for us. The priest fulfilling his office stands pronouncing those words, but the power and the grace are of

God. This is My body, He says. This word transmutes the things that lie to open view."—*Hom. I., de prodit. Judæ.*

S. Augustine, A. D. 400:

"Christ was carried in His own hands, when, committing to us His own very body, He says, This is My body. For He carried that body in His own hands."—*Hom. IV., in Ps.* xxxii.

"Wavering, I turn myself to Christ, because I look for Him here, and I find how the earth may be adored without impiety, without impiety may be adored His footstool. For He took upon Him earth from the earth, because flesh is from the earth, and of the flesh of Mary He took flesh. And because He walked here in the very flesh, and that very flesh He gave us to eat unto salvation—but no one eateth that flesh unless he have first adored it. We have found in what way such footstool of the Lord may be adored, and we not only do not sin by adoring, but sin by not adoring."—*Hom. IV., in Ps.* xcviii.

S. Cyril, of Alexandria, A. D. 424:

"Christ receives us to-day as His guests, to-

day Christ ministers to us. Christ, that loveth man, refresheth us. Awful is what is said, awful what is done; the fatted calf is sacrificed, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world is slain. The Father is gladdened; the Son is willingly sacrificed, not to-day by God's enemies, but by Himself, that He may show that the saving passion was voluntary. . . . . The Creator sets Himself before the work of His own hands to be partaken of; the self-existent gives Himself to mortals for food and drink. Come, eat my bread, is His invitation, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you. I have prepared Myself for food, I have mingled Myself for those that desire Me." —*Hom. in Mystic. Cœnam.*

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Martyrdom of S. Ignatius. Epistle from the Church of Antioch. A. D. 107.

"We were eye-witnesses of these things with tears, and we passed the whole night within-doors, often with bendings of the knee, and prayer, calling upon the Lord to strengthen us,

who had been weakened by what had taken place. Having fallen asleep for a little while, some of us saw Him of a sudden standing by us and embracing us, while others again saw the blessed Ignatius praying over us."

S. Irenæus, A. D. 178:

"If Eve disobeyed God, yet Mary was persuaded to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might become the advocate of the Virgin Eve. And as the human race was bound to death through a virgin, it is saved through a virgin; the scales being equally balanced, virginal disobedience by virginal obedience."—*Adv. Hæres.*, L. v., ch. xix.

Origen, A. D. 216:

"And all the saints who have departed this life, having still charity towards those who are in this world, if they be said to take care of the salvation of those (who are in the world), and to aid them by their prayers, there will be no impropriety. For it is written in the book of the Machabees, 'This is Jeremias, the prophet of God, who always prays for the people.'" (2 Mach., xv.)—*In Cant. Cantic.*, ii. 5.

S. Cyprian, A. D. 250:

"Let us be mutually mindful of each other, of one heart and one mind, let us ever on either side pray for each other, by mutual love lighten our burdens and difficulties, and if one of us shall, by the speediness of the divine vouchsafement, depart hence the first, let our love continue in the presence of the Lord, let not prayer for our brethren and sisters cease in the presence of the mercy of the Father."—*Ep. ad Cornelium.*

S. Hilary, A. D. 356:

"To those that would fain stand, neither the guardianship of saints nor the defences of angels are wanting. For it is said the mountains are round about him, and the Lord is round about His people, now and forever." (Ps. cxxiv.)—*Tract in Ps.*, cxxiv.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 363:

"We then commemorate all those who have fallen asleep before us; first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God, by their prayers and intercessions, may receive our petitions."—*Catech. Myst. V.*

S. Ephrem Syrus, A. D. 370:

"Ye victorious martyrs who endured torments gladly for the sake of the God and Saviour, ye who have boldness of speech towards the Lord Himself, ye saints intercede for us who are timid and sinful men, full of sloth, that the grace of Christ may come upon us . . . . intercede in behalf of a sinner who sleeps during the time of His bounty, that he may find mercy in that hour when the hidden things of man shall be made manifest."—*Encom. in Martyres.*

S. Gregory of Nyssa, A. D. 370:

"And do thou, Ephrem, that art standing at the divine altar, and art ministering with angels to the life-giving and most holy Trinity, bear us all in remembrance, petitioning for us the remission of sins, and the fruition of an everlasting kingdom."—*De vita Ephrem.*

S. Gregory of Nazianzen, A. D. 370:

"She (Justina, a Christian virgin) having commemorated these, and more than these, and having supplicated the Virgin Mary to aid a virgin in danger, interposes the medicine of fasting and of prostration on the earth."

S. Basil, A. D. 370:

"O, holy choir! O, sacred band! O, unbroken host of warriors! O, common guardians of the human race! Ye gracious sharers of our cares, ye co-operators in prayer, most powerful intercessors, stars of the universe, flowers of the churches!"—*Hom. in* 40 *Martyres.*

S. Epiphanius, A. D. 385:

"I hear that some one is devising some folly regarding the holy and ever-Virgin Mary, and is daring to vomit forth some injurious fancy against her. Whence this wicked temper? Whence this great audacity? Who was there ever, or what age has presumed to utter the name of Mary the holy, and when interrogated has not instantly added in reply—the Virgin? . . . . . But who is he that, instead of hymns and glory, is devising insults and injuries against the holy Virgin, and will not honor that most honorable vessel? 'Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee!' This is she who was foreshadowed by Eve, who, in an obscure sense, received the title of mother of the living. . . . . Whoso honoreth the Lord honoreth also the saint, and whoso puts dishonor on a

saint puts dishonor on his own Lord."—*Adv. Hæres. Collyrid.*

S. Ambrose, A. D. 385 :

"The angels, who have been given us for our protection, are to be invoked on our behalf; the martyrs, whose patronage we seem to have a claim to, by a kind of pledge derived from the body, are to be invoked. They who have washed away, in their own blood, whatsoever sins they might have been guilty of, can put up their supplication for our sins, for these are God's martyrs, our high priests, the beholders of our life and actions."—*De Viduis*, ch. ix.

S. Jerome, A. D. 390 :

"If the apostles and martyrs, while still in the body, can pray for others at a time when they must still be anxious for themselves, how much more after their crowns, victories, and triumphs won! One man, Moses, obtains from God pardon for six hundred thousand men in arms, and Stephen, the imitator of his Lord and the first martyr in Christ, begs forgiveness for his persecutors; and shall their power be less after they have begun to be with Christ? The

apostle Paul declares that two hundred threescore and sixteen souls, sailing with him, were freely given him, and after he is dissolved and has begun to be with Christ, shall he close his lips and not be able to utter a word in behalf of those who, throughout the whole world, believed at his preaching of the Gospel?"—*T. II., Adv. Vigilant.*, v. 6–7.

S. J. Chrysostom, A. D. 387:

"Perhaps a great affection toward these saints has been excited in you; let us, then, with this ardor, fall down before their relics; let us embrace their shrines, for even the shrines of the martyrs are capable of having much power, even as their bones have great virtue. And not on this festival only, but on other days also let us take our stand by them; let us invoke these saints; let us implore them to become our patronesses, for they have great power, not merely during life, but also after death, yea, much greater after death. For they now bear the stigmata of Christ, and displaying those stigmata, they are able to persuade the King to any thing."—*Hom. de S. Bernice et Prosdoce, in fine.*

S. Augustin, A. D. 400:

"Of the martyrs, the justice is perfect, because in their passion itself they were perfected. For this cause, prayer is not offered for them in the Church. For the other faithful departed we pray; for martyrs we do not pray. For they departed so perfect as not to be our clients but our advocates. Neither are they this in themselves, but in Him to whom they cleaved perfect members to the head."—*Serm.* 285, n. 5.

S. Cyril of Alexandria, A. D. 424:

"Hail, holy Trinity, which has called us together into this church of Mary, Mother of God! Hail, Mary, Mother of God, venerable treasury of the whole world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, sceptre of orthodoxy, indestructible temple, repository of the illimitable, mother and virgin, through whom, He who cometh in the name of the Lord, is in the holy Gospel called blessed. Hail, thou that didst contain the illimitable in thy hallowed virgin-womb; through whom the Trinity is hallowed; through whom the precious cross is celebrated and is worshipped throughout the whole world; through whom angels and archangels are filled

with gladness; through whom heaven exults; through whom demons are put to flight; through whom the tempter-devil fell from heaven; through whom the fallen creature is taken up to heaven; through whom every creature held under the power of an idol-madness has come to the knowledge of the truth; through whom holy baptism is the portion of believers. . . . . And who amongst us is able to proclaim the thrice-glorious Mary? . . . . Be it ours to worship the undivided Trinity, hymning the praises of Mary, ever-virgin, and of her Son."—*T. V., P. II. Hom. Diver. Hom. Ephes.*

S. Basil of Seleucia, A. D. 446:

"How shall I attempt the virgin ocean and search into the depths of the mighty mystery, if thou, O Mother of God, teach not me, who am like an inexperienced swimmer, to put off the old man who is corrupted according to the desires of error (Ephes. iv. 22); if thou do not fill the mouth of my understanding with mercy, that I may penetrate to the depths of thy child-bearing, that, being surrounded with the light of thy mercy, I may find the pearl of truth

within thee. And do thou aid me to the obtaining of this mighty thing, that, being taught by thee, I may be able to speak concerning thee, not as to *how* thou didst bring forth the Incarnate Word—for the manner of thy parturition is beyond any *how*—save that thou wert both a mother and remainedst a virgin. What tongue, then, so eloquent that it shall worthily hymn her praises? For through her have we been found worthy of great blessings. With what flowers of praise shall we weave a crown befitting her? For of her the flower of Jesse germinated and crowned our race with glory and honor. What gifts shall we offer worthy of her, of whom all the things of this world are not worthy? For if Paul says of the other saints, 'of whom the world was not worthy,' what shall we say of the Mother of God, who outshines all the martyrs as much as the sun does the stars? . . . .

"Who, then, will not marvel at the great power of the Mother of God, and at how far she exceeds all the saints whom we honor? For if Christ bestowed so much favor upon His servants as not only to cure the afflicted by their touch, but to do this even by their shadow,

what must we needs think the power bestowed upon His mother? Would it not be much greater than that of His servants? This is plain to every one. . . . .

"Let us offer up to the Mother of God such words as these: 'O, all-holy Virgin, of whom whoso utters all that is venerable and glorious errs not against the truth, but against thy dignity, mayest thou, looking down from on high propitiously upon us, govern us now in peace; but having led us to the throne of judgment, free from shame, make us, rapt unto heaven, partakers of the station at His right hand, and with angels we will sing the uncreated and consubstantial Trinity.' "—*Orat.* xxxix.

THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY.

S. Cyprian, A. D. 248:

"It is one thing to stand for pardon, another to arrive at glory; one thing for him who has been cast into prison not to go out thence till he pay the last farthing, another to receive immediately the reward of faith and courage; one thing for a man, tormented by long anguish for

his sins, to be cleansed and long purged by fire, another to have purged away all sins by suffering (martyrdom); finally, one thing to wait in suspense unto the day of judgment for the sentence of the Lord, another to be crowned by the Lord immediately."—*Ep. LII. ad Antonianum.*

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, A. D. 363:

"Then we also commemorate those who have fallen asleep before us, first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, that God, by their prayers and intercessions, would receive our petition; then, also, on behalf of the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and of all, in short, who have already fallen asleep from amongst us, believing that it will be a very great assistance to the souls for whom the supplication is put up, while the holy and most awful sacrifice lies to open view. And I wish to persuade you by an illustration, for I know that many say this: 'what is a soul profited which departs from this world, either with sins or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer?' Now, surely, if a king had banished certain who had offended him, and their connections, having woven a crown, should offer it to him on behalf of those

under his vengeance, would he not grant a respite to their punishments? In the same way we also, offering up to Him supplications on behalf of those who have fallen asleep before us, even though they be sinners, weave no crown, but offer up for our sins Christ crucified, propitiating, both on their behalf and on our own, the God that loves man."—*Catech. Mystag. V.*

S. Ephrem, A. D. 370:

"Let us pray distinctly and by name, my brethren, for our brother who has departed from us. Let us supplicate the Judge who hearkens to the prayers of those that love Him. O God, thou that willest not the death but the life of the sinner, in thy goodness have mercy on thy servant, and in thy clemency be propitious to thy worshipper. Enter not, O Lord, into rigorous judgment with thy servant, for no one is clean from debts and faults. Remember not his sins and transgressions. Forgive his debts according to thy clemency, and place him at thy right hand."—*T. III., Carm. Funeb.* 16.

S. Gregory of Nyssa, A. D. 370:

"Some there are who, throughout their life

in the flesh, regulate their lives in a spiritual manner, and free from passions; such, we are told, were the patriarchs and prophets, and they who lived with them and after them, men who hastened back to the perfect, by means of virtue and the pursuit of wisdom—whilst others, through their entry into the future state, have cast aside, in the purgatorial fire, their propensity to the material, and have returned gladly from an eager desire of good things to that grace which was at first the inheritance of our nature."—*De mortuis*, 636.

S. John Chrysostom, A. D. 387:

"Nor do we in vain make commemoration of the departed during the divine mysteries, and approach God in their behalf, beseeching the Lamb that lies before us, who taketh away the sins of the world, but that some consolation may therefore arise to them. Nor in vain does he that stands by the altar, when the awful mysteries are being celebrated, cry out, 'For all that have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who are performing commemorations on their behalf.' For, if there were no commemorations made for them, these words would not have

been spoken, for our services are not mere scenery. God forbid! for by the ordinance of the Spirit these things are done. Let us, therefore, help them, and perform commemorations for them. For, if the father's sacrifice purged Job's children, why dost thou doubt whether, when we too offer up for the departed, some consolation accrues to them; for God is wont to grant favors to those who ask for others.

"Let us not, then, grow weary of helping the departed, of offering up our prayers for them, for even the common expiation of the world lies before us."—*Hom. XLI., on Ep. I. ad Corinth.*

S. Augustin, A. D. 400:

"Rebuke me not, O Lord, in thy indignation. May I not be amongst those to whom Thou wilt say, 'Go into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels.' Nor chastise me in thy wrath; that Thou mayest purify me, and make me such that I may no longer need that amending fire which is for those who shall be saved yet so as by fire. Wherefore, but because they build upon the foundation wood, hay, stubble? But had they

built gold, silver, precious stones, they would be safe even from both fires—not only from that eternal fire, which will torment the impious forever, but also from that which will chasten those who shall be saved by fire. For it is said, 'But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' And because it is said, 'He shall be saved,' that fire is despised. Yet assuredly, though saved by fire, still will that fire be more grievous than any thing that man can suffer in this life."—*T. IV. in Psal.* XXXVII.

"Nor is it to be denied that the souls of the departed are relieved by their living friends, when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them, or alms are performed in the Church. But these things benefit those who merited, when living, that these things should be able to benefit them afterwards. For there is a certain manner of living, neither so good as not to require these things after death, nor so bad as to be incapable of being benefited by them after death; whilst there is a manner of living so advanced in good as not to require these things; and, again, there is another so far advanced in evil as to be incapable of being

helped, even by these things, when this life has passed away."—*De cura pro mortuis.*

NOTE B.

It will be interesting to know something of the numerical condition of those who in one form or another, profess Christianity.

The number of Catholics, throughout the world, is estimated at two hundred millions.

The members of the orthodox Greek Church do not fall far short of sixty-six millions.

The Lutherans, in Europe, number nearly twenty-eight millions in Germany and the northern States, while there are as many as two millions in Russia, and nearly the same number in Austria. A writer in the American Cyclopædia gives the whole number of Protestants throughout the world at eighty-eight millions, and classifies them as follows:

"I. America.—British America, 2,200,000; United States, 21,000,000; South America, 20,000; Dutch Possessions, 35,500; Danish

and Swedish Possessions, 55,000; Hayti, 2,000: total, 23,312,500.

"II. EUROPE.—Portugal, 7,000; Spain, 5,000; France, 794,230; Austria, 3,368,152; Prussia, 10,548,893; the other German States, 11,240,176; Italy, 46,331; Switzerland, 1,417,754; Holland, 1,990,304; Belgium, 25,000; Great Britain and her European colonies, 22,000,000; Denmark, 1,887,000; Sweden and Norway, 5,067,000; Russia, 3,918,000; Turkey, 10,000; Ionian Isles, 2,000: total, 62,327,206.

"III. ASIA.—Asiatic Russia, 40,000; China, 10,000; East Indies, 300,000; Asiatic Turkey, 6,000; Indian Archipelago, 50,000; Persia, 1,000; Arabia, 2,000: total, 409,000.

"IV. AFRICA.—Cape of Good Hope, 250,000; Algeria, 10,000; Egypt, 2,000; Liberia, 50,000; Southern and Western Africa, 400,000: total, 712,000.

"V. Australasia and Polynesia, 1,320,000."

This estimate has certainly been liberally made, and includes, no doubt, all who adopt any system whatever opposed to the Catholic religion.

The different denominations in the United States are thus given in the same volume. The

statistics are interesting, even if they are not entirely exact.

African Methodists	26,746
Baptists, Regular	1,036,756
" Anti-Mission	60,000
" Seventh-Day	6,736
" Six-Principle	3,000
" Free-Will	61,441
River-Brethren	7,000
Winebrennarians	14,000
Dunkers	8,700
Mennonites	36,280
Christians (Unitarian)	180,000
Congregationalists	257,634
" (Unitarian)	30,000
Disciples (Campbellites)	350,000
Episcopal	160,000
Friends, Orthodox	54,000
" Hicksite	40,000
German Evangelical	33,000
German Reformed	79,000
Jews	200,000
Lutherans	232,780
Methodist Episcopal, North	988,523
" " South	499,694
" Protestant	99,000
" Wesleyan	21,000

Mormons	61,000
Presbyterians, Old School	292,857
" New School	134,933
" Cumberland	84,249
" United	55,547
" Associate Reformed	2,009
Protestant Reformed Dutch	50,304
Roman Catholic Church	3,177,140
Second Advent	20,000
Shakers	4,700
Swedenborgians	1,850
United Brethren (Moravians)	8,275
United Brethren in Christ	82,013
Universalists	600,000

260.21
P62
Preston, Thomas S.
AUTHOR
Lectures on Christian Unity